



This PDF you are browsing is in a series of several scanned documents containing the collection of Peerzada Muhammad Ashraf Sahib. b 1958

CV:

Residence: Towheed Abad Bemina,  
Srinagar

[https://www.facebook.com/  
peerzadamohd.ashraf.16](https://www.facebook.com/peerzadamohd.ashraf.16)

Former Deputy Director Archives,  
Archaeology and Museums Deptt. J&K  
Govt.

Former State Coordinator National  
Manuscripts Mission GoI.

Former Registering Officer Antiquities,  
Jammu and Kashmir Govt.

Former Registrar National Records,  
Jammu and Kashmir Govt.

Worked as Lecturer Arabic in Higher  
Education Department.

Studied at Aligarh Muslim University.

Lives in Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir.



From Anantnag.

Peerzada Muhammad Ashraf Sahib has an ancestral Collection of Rare Books and Manuscripts in Sharada, Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic, Urdu, Kashmiri in his Home Town Srinagar.

Besides manuscripts, he also has many rare paintings (60+).

Collectors and Art/Literature Lovers can contact him if they wish through his facebook page

Scanning and upload by eGangotri Foundation.





# VEDIC PHILOSOPHY

BY

P. T. GURU DATTA

VIDYARTHI M. A.

EDITED BY

DURGA PRASAD,

Editor of the *Harbinger*,

LAHORE.

Second Edition

1000

}

1900

}

Price Per Copy

12 annas.

Virajanand Press Lahore.



# CONTENTS.

	Pag
Life of the Author ... ..	...
Terminology of the Vedas ... ..	...
Ditto      and European Scholars ... ..	I
The Atmosphere Vedic Text No. I ... ..	...
Mitram huve      ditto      do. II ... ..	...
Udutyam      ditto      do. III ... ..	87
Ishopanishat ... ..	98
Exposition ... ..	103
Mandukyopanishat ... ..	123
Expositition ... ..	133
Pecuniomania ... ..	164
Evidences of the Human Spirit ... ..	182
The Realities of the Inner Life ... ..	229
Criticicism on Monier William's Indian Wisdom ... ..	242
Lecture I The Hymns of the Vedas ... ..	259
Lecture II      Ditto      ... ..	287
Do. IV      ... ..	290
Rev. T. Williams' Criticism on Niyoga ... ..	2
Rev. T. Williams' Letter ... ..	...

## THE

# TERMINOLOGY OF THE VEDAS.

---

THE question of the origin, nature and eternity of *Shabda*—human, articulate and inspired speech—has been a very important question in Sanskrit literature. The highly philosophical character of this question cannot be doubted, but the peculiar characteristic, which attracts the attention of every Sanskrit scholar, is the all-pervading nature of the influence it exerts on other departments of human knowledge. It is not only the *Nairuktikas* and the *Valyakaranis*, the grammarians, etymologists and philologists of ancient Sanskrit times, that take up this question; but even the acute and subtle philosopher—the last and the best Sanskrit metaphysician—the disciple of the learned Vyasa—the founder of one of the six schools of philosophy—the religious aphorist Jaimini cannot isolate the treatment of his subject from the influence of this question. He runs in the very beginning of his *Mimansa* (dissertation) into this question and assigns a very considerable part (proportionately) of his treatise to the elucidation of this question. It is not difficult for a reader of modern philology, well versed in discussions on onomatopœian and other artificial theories of human speech, to perceive the amount of wrangling which such questions give rise to. We have mentioned the position assigned to this question in Sanskrit literature not so much with a view to put an end to all this wrangling



which, perhaps, is unavoidable, but with a view to take up, in a brief way, another and a more practical question involved therein, i.e., the question of the interpretation of Vedic terminology.

Up to this time all the plans that have been adopted for the interpretation of Vedic terminology have been based on some preconceived notions. The philosophy of the subject requires that these preconceived notions should be carefully examined, studied and pruned of the extraneous matter liable to introduce error, whereas new and more rational methods should be sought after and interposed—methods such as may throw futher light upon the subject.

To examine, then, the various methods that have upto this time been pursued. Briefly speaking, they are three in number, and may, for want of better denomination, be called the Mythological, Antiquarian and Contemporary methods.

Firstly, the Mythological method. This method interprets the Vedas as myths, as an embodiment of simple natural truths in the imaginative language of religious fiction, as a symbolic representation of the *actual* in the *ideal*, as an imbedding of primitive truth in the superincumbent strata of non-essential show and ceremony. Now, in so far as this concretion of thought in mythological network goes, it assumes a comparatively rude and simple stage of human life and experience. From this basis of a primitive savage state it gradually evolves the ideas of God and religion, which no sooner done than mythic period ends. It further argues thus:—In the ruder stages of civilisation, when laws of nature are little

known and but very little understood, analogy plays a most important part in the performance of intellectual functions of man. The slightest semblance, or visage of semblance, is enough to justify the exercise of analogy. The most palpable of the forces of nature impress the human mind, in such a period of rude beginnings of human experience, by motions mainly. The wind blowing, the fire burning, a stone falling, or a fruit dropping, affects the senses essentially as moving. Now, throughout the range of conscious exertion of muscular power, *will* precedes motion, and, since even the most grotesque experience of a savage in this world assumes this knowledge, it is no great stretch of intellectual power to argue that these natural forces also, to which the sensible motions are due, are endowed with the faculty of will. The personification of the forces of nature being thus effected, their deification soon follows. The overwhelming potency, the unobstructible might, and often the violence, with which, in the sight of a savage, these forces operate, strike him with terror, awe and reverence. A sense of his own weakness, humility and inferiority creeps over the savage mind, and, what was intellectually personified, becomes emotionally deified. According to this view, the Vedas, undoubtedly books of primitive times, consist of prayers from such an emotional character addressed to the forces of nature including wind and rain—prayers breathing passions of the savage or vengeance or for propitiation.

Whilst deductive psychology affords these data, right or wrong as they may be, comparative philology and comparative mythology considerably support these views. A comprison of the mythologies of various



countries shows that the working of human intellect is analogous, that this process of mythification is not only everywhere universal, but coincident. The Scandinavian, Greek and Indian mythologies have no clear line of demarcation, save the accidental one of differentiation due to climatic effects. Comparative philology not only admits the universality and coincidence of these phenomena, but traces even phonetic identity in the linguistic garb with which these phenomena are clothed.

The evidence from these three sources—comparative philology, deductive psychology and comparative mythology—is indeed very great; and we have stated the nature of this method and the evidence upon which its validity depends at much greater length than the short space at our disposal could allow us, so that, for 'fairness' sake at least, the value and merits of this method may not be underrated.

The results of comparative philology and comparative mythology need not be denied. They are the starting points in our discussion, the assumed axioms in the present subject. The *causus belli*, the debatable land, lies beyond them; in fact, below them. They are the facts—recognized matter of truth. How are they to be explained? And like explanations of all other things, here too, there may be alternative explanations, rival hypotheses, parallel theories to confront the same facts and phenomena. That mythologies of various countries are similar, may be explained as much on the hypothesis that laws of psychological development are everywhere the same, as on the hypothesis that they are all derived from a common parental system of mythology or religion. Phonetic similarities

apart from their doubtful and frequently whimsical character, may analogously be traced to the operation of analogous organs and phonetic laws, or to a common parent language from which all the others are derived. Nor can these methods have any further claims to settle the dispute between these rival theories. As methods they can only discover mythic or phonetic similarities or affinities, but cannot explain them. Even if we leave out of consideration the alternative character of the conclusions arrived at, the explanations possess, considered from the standpoint of inductive validity, a very low, specific value. We seek the explanation not from a fact already known to exist—we only inferentially assume a fact to have existed, whilst we are at the same time assuming the validity of our inference. The assumed fact, from which the desired explanation is sought, is not inferred from any independent evidence, but is itself a link in the self-returning series of concatenated facts. Further, the growth of mythology is deductively inferred from some psychological data. It might as easily have been inferred as a degenerate, crippled, and then stitched and glossed remnant of a purer and truer religion. An author has well spoken of the degeneracy of things (including doctrines pre-eminently,) if left alone. Nor is this fact in any way an obscure one to the student of the history of church dogmas and opinions. Who does not know of religious practices, primarily designed to meet certain real wants, degenerating, after a lapse of time, on the cessation of those wants, into mere ceremonies and customs which are regarded not as accidents, but as essentials? Mythologies, as well as mythic practices, then, may arise either as products of human imagination



working under subdued intellect and petrified reason, or as an outgrowth of a distorted remnant of a purer and truer form of religion.

There is not one hypothesis in connection with this subject that has not a counter hypothesis, not one theory whose claims are not met with by a rival theory. Independently of the vague character of these hypotheses—the philological and mythological ones—the uncertainty of the conclusions deduced from them cannot be lost sight of. Like the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Pocock in his “India in Greece,” wherein he traces the origin of all Greek geographical names to Sanskrit Indian names, and whereby he infers the colonization of Greece by the Indians, the conclusions arrived at according to the aforesaid hypothesis constitute one full chain of circular reasonings continually returning into themselves. Admitting the cognate relation that exists between the Greek and Sanskrit languages, it must follow that Greek names of localities must bear a remote and far-fetched (as contrasted with a direct and palpable) identity to Indian names of localities. The colonization of Greece by the Indians is not the just conclusion to be drawn from the specific topographical relations, which Mr. Pocock has traced, independently of the common origin of Greek and Sanskrit languages. The identity of Greek and Sanskrit stock is a general formula which cannot be any further proved by such specific connections. The fact of the identity of several systems of mythologies and languages also leads to a distinct general proposition—the uniformity of human nature. Beyond the value of this general proposition, the specific mythological and philological facts have no independent value. Their value is subsumed

in the general proposition. These particular propositions, when right, *cannot* add to the value of the general proposition which they go to form, but, when wrong, they *can materially vitiate* the truth of the general proposition. A conclusion based upon the legitimacy of a *general* order of nature, or a *universal* law, can drive no real independent logical strength from the enumeration of particular instances of such order or law, all similar in kind. All the remarks that have been made above may in one sense be considered to bear upon the question of comparative mythology in general, as having no distinct individualized influence on the terminology of the Vedas. There is one other point, however, which comes directly into contact with the mythological theory as concerned with the terminology of the Vedas. Mythology, as already remarked, is the symbolization of human thought in the concrete. The contrast, therefore, of mythology with the abstract is the widest and the most thorough going.

Philosophy, as analysed by Herbert Spencer, has for its object the elucidation of *ultimate* truths or laws. These truths, in so far as ultimate, must be the *most general*. The wider the group of individual facts that a law covers, or the greater the distance of the ultimate law from the minute sub-laws covering a very limited and primary area the more abstract and the less concrete does its expression become. Philosophy and mythology, therefore, stand contrasted—completely contrasted to one another in this respect. Philosophy is abstract, expressed in general terms and ultimate formulæ; mythology is concrete, expressed in gross material terms and representing primary objects and phases of objects. Nothing therefore is so completely subversive of the value of the mythological



method as the existence of philosophy and philosophic ideas in the Vedas. That the Vedas are books of philosophy and not of mythology, must not be admitted merely because a well-known professor and scholar of Sanskrit acknowledges that the germ of human thought and reason lies in the Vedas, whereas, according to him, its culmination lies in the philosophy of Kant, but on other and more trustworthy bases and authorities. The growth of philosophy in Sanskrit literature is earlier than the growth of mythology. The Upanishads and the Darshanas, which are professedly books of philosophy and confessedly nearer to the Vedas, chronologically preceded, and not followed, the Puranas, the embodiment of mythological literature of India. It was philosophy that was evolved from the Vedas and not mythology. In the history of Indian literature, at least, it is not mythology that gives birth to philosophy, but philosophy that precedes mythology. How far mythology may rise as an out-growth and a distorted remnant of a purer and truer form of religion or philosophy, might perhaps now have been rendered more evident. Now the six schools of philosophy are, all of them, based on the Vedas, and support themselves by direct quotations from the Vedas. Not only then has philosophy been evolved from the Vedas, but substantially drawn out and evolved or developed subsequently. There is one, and only one objection that can be raised against the above views. It is that the different portions of the Vedas belong to different epochs, for whilst some portions are mythological, others are decidedly philosophical. We would not here say what is already well known, that, however it may be, not one line of the Vedas is later than the Darshanas or

the Upanishads, not to speak of the Puranas. However greatly wide apart may be the epochs assigned to the various portions of the Vedas, no stretch of artificial reasoning can make them coincide with the Puranic period. Independently of these considerations, which are important however, the very assignment of different epochs to the Vedas proves the insufficiency and partial character of the mythological system. The truth of the mythological system lies in the isolations of the portions of the Vedas. It is not the Vedas as a whole that furnish an illustration of this method, but in part. But what reason have we to isolate these portions or to split up the homogeneous mass into two? Simply this, that they belong to two distinct epochs. Now the assertion that the portions belong to two distinct epochs is itself grounded upon the insufficiency of the mythological method. If they could interpret the whole of the Vedas by the one mythological method, there could be no need of separating them. This they could not, and therefore the isolation. The justification of the partial character of the mythological method depending upon the correctness of the assignment of the various epochs, such assignment has an authority save the insufficiency of the mythological method. Thus, then, is the partial character of the mythological method unconsciously regarded as self-sufficient. The first method then, out of the three enumerated in the beginning of this subject, considered independently, proves insufficient; considered in conjunction with philology fares no better; and lastly fails in contrast with the philosophic character of the Vedas. We will now consider the second method.

One of the most successful methods of unravelling ancient literary records is the antiquarian or the historical



method. It consists in approximating, in so far as possible, for the interpretation and explanation of the records in hand, to the books and general literature of the period to which it belongs. For the obvious reason that direct evidence is always to be preferred to second hand information, this method is next in value to none, but to the direct evidence of the senses. Now, in so far as in historical research, where the study of the past epoch is concerned, one has inevitably to fall for information on the literature and historical record of the period with which he is concerned, an examination of the conditions, which render such evidence valid and a labour on it no unfruitful task, is essential to establish the canons of historical research. The veracity of our knowledge of past events depends upon two factors, on this method; firstly on the faithfulness of the records we obtain of the event or events of the period, and secondly on the faithfulness of our interpretation of the records. We would forego an analysis of the first factor as this factor is amenable, for the estimation of its evidence, to laws which do not come within the compass of our subject. The interpretation of the records is what directly concerns us.

The excellence of historical or the antiquarian method lies in the fact that it renders our interpretation of past records less liable to error. And the reason may be thus explained. Language, like all other things that live or are of organised growth, is subject to constant variations, to variations depending partly on the laws of development of phonetic organs, partly on external circumstances of fusion and introduction of foreign languages, and partly on the laws of the evolution of human

thought itself. Owing to this and many other causes, all living languages are daily undergoing changes, which accumulate and appear after a sufficiently long interval to have created very different, though cognate, languages. Any thing, thought, or philosophic system, that is invested with linguistic garb, therefore, requires for its correct interpretation that the laws which govern those linguistic variations and the variations of the sense of words should be carefully studied. Otherwise our interpretation would suffer from misconception and anachronism. To take a concrete example, let us consider the case of the Roman Republic. In the time of the Roman Republic, when public press was unknown, newspapers unheard of locomotive engines undreamt, and other means that engender or facilitate the communication of indelible impression of human thought or reason unthought of, and when Forum was the only place of resort for all audience, and oratory had a totally different meaning from that of modern times, the Senate signified a different institution from what it now is; Republic or democracy of the people —the people then existing— was what would be to us something like oligarchy, though very different from it in many essential features. Now a reader studying the literature of the period corresponding to the Roman Republic would find his information of that period incommensurate with facts, if on account of his being unguided in his studies the words Democracy, Republic, and the like, were to call forth before his mind what they now signify. Such a knowledge would be inconsistent with itself, a medley of two epochs, and would be such as on critical examination would be termed sheer nonsense.



The applications of this method in the domain of history are, beyond doubt, various and most important. But not the less important are its applications in the fixing of the dates, or the succession of periods, of the Puranas, the Darshanas, the Upanishads, Manu, the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, and so on. Various professors have fruitlessly tried to fix dates of these writings by searching in them, in most cases in vain, for any well established consistent historical facts. But far more important in the fixing of these dates, is the knowledge of historical evolution of Sanskrit literature. The Sanskrit of the Puranas is so different from the Sanskrit of the Mahabharata, and that of the Darshanas, which again is so different from that of the Upanishads, that a clear line of demarcation in each case is easily laid down. The one cannot be confounded with the other.

It is a matter of great surprise and wonder that in the case of the Vedas the method, whose merits are so evident and obvious, and which is so well recognised, in the domain of history, should not have been applied, or so loosely and carelessly applied, as to render modern interpretations of the Vedas by some very well-known professors of Sanskrit simply unintelligible and absurd.

In the case of the Vedas the learned professors of Sanskrit, whose versions of the Vedas are so extant have all derived their inspirations from the commentaries on the Vedas by Mahidhara, Ravana, and Sayana, writers of a period decidedly very much latter than that of the Vedas, and only well coinciding with our own time. These writers themselves were as much

ignorant of the terminology of the Vedas as we are. Their interpretations of Vedic terms, according to their meanings extant in their own times, were as wrong as would be those of words like democracy in our studies concerning ancient Rome. Mahidhara and Sayana fare in no way better than ourselves. It seems astonishing that in adopting the interpretation of the Vedas by Sayana and Ravana, our modern professors of Sanskrit should have forgotten the invaluable maxim that the nearer we approximate to the literature of the period to which the Vedas belong for their interpretation, the greater would be our chances of the interpretation being more probable and more correct. According to the date assigned by these professors to the Vedas, their interpretation of the Vedas would be based on the literature of a period so heterogeneous to the times and spirit of the Vedas as to give rise to nothing but confusion and error.

To the view of any impartial reader, who has studied the investigation of Goldstucker on this point, the whole fabric of dates crumbles to dust, and the whole system of modern recognized chronology is easily upset. According to the best (and they are, as a matter of fact, the worst) authorities on the subject, no writings of date anterior to five or six thousand years before Christ seem to have existed. The whole world seems to have been circumscribed within 8,000 years. The whole region of the intellectual activity of man seems to have been focussed in the 6,000 years before Christ.

Irrespective of these views let us come directly to the subject of the Vedas. The Shatapatha and the Nirukta



are confessedly books of much anterior date to the commentaries of Sayana, Ravana and Mahidhara. We should rather resort to them and the Upanishads than to the times of the Puranas, of Ravana and of Mahidhara, for the interpretation of the Vedas.

The Upanishads inculcate monotheism. Where, in the the Upanishads or the Shatapatha, do Indra, Mitra, and Varuna signify the deities and not the Deity? The Nirukta even lays down explicit rules on the terminology of the Vedas which are as yet quite unheeded by the modern professors.

The Niruktakara in the very beginning of his book forcibly inculcates that the terms used in the Vedas are *Yaugika* (possessing derived meaning) as contrasted with *Rurhis* (terms having conventional, arbitrary or concrete meaning). We will on some future occasion quote a full length from the Nirukta, and render a better exposition of the doctrine. Here, however, we have simply said what the main assertion of the Nirukta is. This assertion is supported by the Mahabhashya and other older books on the subject, including the Sangraha.

If the main line pursued in discussing the question of the Terminology of the Vedas be correct, the conclusion we have arrived at leads to the following inquiry :—

What is the opinion of ancient Vedic scholars on the subject? Are the authors of the Nirukta, the Nighantu the Mahabhashya, and the Sangraha, and other old, commentators at one with the modern commentators, *i.e.* Ravana, Sayana, Mahidharra, and others who have of late followed the same line; or are they at variance with the modern writers? That, if they differ, reliance must be

placed upon old commentators. the preceding remarks would have made clear. Let us then examine the views of ancient writers on this subject.

Speaking broadly, then, three classes of words are used in the Sanskrit language; the *yaugika* the *rurhi* and the *yoga-rurhi* words. A *yaugika* word is one that has a *derivative* meaning, that is, one that only signifies the meaning of its root together with the modifications effected by the affixes. In fact, the structural elements, out of which the word is compounded, afford the whole and the only clue to the true signification of the word. These being known, no other element is needed to complete its sense. Speaking in the language of modern logic, the word is all *connotation*, and by virtue of its connotation determines also its denotation. A *rurhi* word is the name of a definite concrete object, or answers to a definite concrete technical sense, not by virtue of any of its connotations, but by virtue merely of an arbitrary principle. In the case of a *yaugika* word, we arrive at the name of an object by what may be called the process of generalisation. We see, taste, touch, smell, and operate upon the object by the multifarious means man possesses of investigating properties of sensible objects, we compare the sensible impressions it yields with sensible impressions already retained in our minds and constituting our past knowledge; we detect similarities between the two, and thus get a *general* or a *generic* conception. To this generic conception we give an *appropriate* name by *synthetically* arriving at it from a *root*, a *primitive idea* or *ideas*. The word, therefore, thus ultimately formed, embodies the whole history of the intellectual activity of man



In the case of a *rurhi* word, the process is far different. We do not generalise. Nor is, therefore, any synthesis required there. We only roughly discriminate one object or class of objects from other objects, and arbitrarily place a phonetic *postmark*, as it were, upon it. An individual, to roughly discriminate him from others, is arbitrarily called John, another, Jones ; so an object is arbitrarily denominated *Khatva*, another *Mala*, and so on. Here, we only discriminatively specify the object we are naming, without coming into general contact with it.

A third class of words, *yoga-rurhi*, is one in which two words are synthetically combined into a compound, denoting a third object by virtue of the combination of these two words. Such words express any relation, or interaction of phenomena. The *Kamala* stands, for instance, in the relation of the *born to mud*, the *bearer* ; hence *kamala* is denominated as *pankaja*, (*panka*, the mud, and *ja* signifying to bear).

Now the author of the Mahabhashya maintains that the Vedic terminology is all *yaugika*.

*Nama cha dhatujamaha Nirukte vyakarane shakatasya cha tokam"*

"*Naigama rurhi bhavam hi susadhu.*"—Mahabhashya chap. iii, sect. iii., aph, i. which means :—

Etymologically speaking, there are three classes of words, the *yuagika*, the *rurhi* and the *yoga-rurhi*. But the authors of the *niruktas*, Yaska and others, and Shakatayana, among the grammarians, believe all the words to be derived from *dhatu*s, that is, believe them to be *yaugikas* and *yoga-rurhis*, and Panini and others

believe them to be *rūrhis* also. But all the *Rishis* and *Munis*, ancient authors and commentators, without exception, regard Vedic terms to be *yaugikas* and *yoga-rūrhis* only ; and the *laukika* terms to be *rūrhis* also.

The above is a clear and definite statement of the Mahābhashya to the effect that the Vedic terms are all *yaugika*. It is not difficult to prove by numerous and long quotations from the Nirukta, Sangrah and other older writings, that all of them agree as to the nature of the Vedic terms.

Without going, then, into the details of this subject, it may be assumed that the Vedic writers of older epochs do not agree with those of modern times.

It is a strange thing to find our modern professors of Sanskrit, well versed philologists, and professed antiquarians so forcibly asserting the value of the "Antiquarian Method," and yet blundering at the very outset of this momentous question.

After the remarks we have made, it is not surprising to find that our modern scholars should think of finding mythological data in the Vedas, or of having come across the facts of ruder bronze age, or golden age, in that book of barbaric hymns.





## THE TERMINOLOGY OF THE VEDAS AND EUROPEAN SCHOLARS.

---

With us, the question of the terminology of the Vedas is of the highest importance, for upon its decision will depend the verdict to be passed by the future world respecting the great controversy to rage between the East and the West, concerning the supremacy of the Vedic Philosophy. And even now, the determination of this question involves issues of great value. For, if the Vedic Philosophy be true, the interpretations of the Vedas, as given at present by Professor Max Muller and other European scholars must not only be regarded as imperfect, defective and incomplete, but as altogether false. Nay, in the light of true reason and sound scholarship, we are forced to admit their entire ignorance of the very rudiments of Vedic language and philosophy. We are not alone in the opinion we hold. Says Schopenhauer, "I add to this the impression, which the translations of Sanskrit works by European scholars, with very few exceptions, produce on my

---

\* A paper of this name was submitted to the public by the writer early in 1888, but it was necessarily brief and incomplete. It has now been thought advisable to give to the same thoughts and principles a new garb, more suited to the requirements of the reading public of the present day, to amplify the same truths by interesting illustrations, and to supplement them by others that are necessary to complete the treatment of the subject.

mind. I cannot resist a certain suspicion that our Sanskrit scholars do not understand their text much better than the higher class of school boys their Greek or Latin." It will be well to note here the opinion of Swami Dayanand Saraswati, the most profound scholar of Sanskrit of his age, on the subject. He says,—“The impression that the Germans are the best Sanskrit scholars, and that no one has read so much of Sanskrit as Professor Max Muller, is altogether unfounded. Yes, in a land where lofty trees never grow, even *ricinus communis* or the castor-oil plant may be called an oak. The study of Sanskrit being altogether out of question in Europe, the Germans and Professor Max Muller may there have come to be regarded as highest authorities..... I came to learn from a letter of a principal of some German University, that even men learned enough to interpret a Sanskrit letter are rare in Germany. I have also made it plain from the study of Max Muller's “History of Sanskrit Literature” and his comments on some mantras of the Veda, that Professor Max Muller has been able only to scribble out something by the help of the so-called *tikas*, or paraphrases of the Vedas, current in India.”†

It is this want of Vedic scholarship among European scholars, this utter ignorance of Vedic language and philosophy that is the cause of so much misimpression and prejudice even in our own country. We are, indeed, so often authoritatively told by our fellow-brethren who have received the highest English education, but are themselves entirely ignorant of Sanskrit, that the

---

† Satyārtha Prakasha, 3rd Edition, page 278.



Vedas are books that teach idol-worship or element-worship, that they contain no philosophical, moral or scientific truths of any great consequence, unless they be the commonest truisms of the kitchen. It is therefore a matter of greatest concern to learn to attach proper value to the interpretations of these European scholars. We propose, to present a rough outline of those general principles, according to which Vedic terms should be interpreted, but which European scholars entirely ignore; and hence much of the misinterpretation that has grown up.

In the discussion of philosophical subjects, pre-conceived notions are the worst enemies to encounter. They not only prejudicially bias the mind, but also take away the truthfulness and honest integrity from the soul, which alone are compatible with the righteous pursuit and discernment of TRUTH. In the treatment of a question such as the estimation of the value of a system of philosophy or religion, extreme sobriety and impartiality of the mind are required. Nor is it to be supposed that a religious or philosophical system can be at once mastered by a mere acquaintance with grammar and language. It is necessary that the mind should, by an adequate previous discipline, be raised to an exalted mental condition, before the recondite and invisible truths of Man and Nature can be comprehended by man. So is it with Vedic philosophy. One must be a complete master of the science of orthoëpy,\* the

---

\* These are the well-known six Vedangas, 1. Shiksha, 2. Vyakarana, 3. Nirukta, 4. Kalpa, 5. Chhanda, and 6. Jyotish.

science of language, the science of etymology, the science of morals, the science of poetry, and the sciences of geology and astronomy; he must be well versed in the philosophy of *dharma*, the philosophy of characteristics, the doctrines of logic or the science of evidence, the philosophy of essential existences, the philosophy of *yoga*, and the philosophy of *vedanta*;† he must be a master of all these and much more, before he can lay claims to a rational interpretation of the Vedas.

Such, then, should be our Vedic scholars—thorough adepts in science and philosophy, unprejudiced, impartial judges and seekers after truth. But if impartiality be supplanted by prejudice, science and philosophy by quasi-knowledge and superstition, and integrity by motive, whereas predetermination takes the place of honest inquiry, Truth is either disguised or altogether suppressed.

Speaking of the religion of the *Upnishads* and the Bible, says Schopenhauer, who has ‘washed himself clean of all early-engrafted Jewish superstitions, and of all philosophy that cringes before these superstitions’ :—

“In India, our religion (Bible) will now and never strike root; the primitive wisdom of the human race will never be pushed aside by the events of Galilee. ‡ On the contrary, Indian wisdom will flow back upon

---

† These are the well known six Upangas or Darshanas;—1. Purva Mimansa, 2. Vaisheshika, 3. Nyaya, 4. Sankhya, 5. Yoga, and 6. Vedanta.

‡ It is well-known how the astronomical and geographical discoveries of Galileo, and his telescope were forced upon the world in spite of the prisons and death-racks of the so-called Christians.—Ed.



Europe, and produce a thorough change in our knowing and thinking."

Let us now hear what Professor Max Muller has to say against the remarks of this unprejudiced, impartial philosopher. He says "Here again, the great philosopher seems to me to have allowed himself to be carried away too far by his enthusiasm for the less known. He is blind for the *dark side of the Upanishat*; and he wilfully shuts his eyes against the bright rays of eternal truths in the Gospel, which even Ram Mohan Roy was quick enough to perceive, behind the mist and clouds of tradition that gather so quickly round the sunrise of every religion."

With the view that the Christianity of Max Muller may be set forth more clearly before the reader, we will quote from the "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature." Says Max Muller—

"But if India has no place in the political history of the world, it certainly has a right to claim its place in the intellectual history of mankind. The less, the Indian nation has taken part in the political struggles of the world, and expended its energies in the exploits of war and the formation of empire, the more it has fitted itself and concentrated all its powers for the fulfilment of the important mission reserved to it in the history of the East. History seems to teach that the whole human race required a gradual education before, in the fulness of time, it could be admitted to the truths of Christianity. All the fallacies of human reason had to be exhausted, before the light of a higher truth could meet with ready acceptance. The ancient religions of the world were but the milk of nature, which was in due time to be succeeded by

the bread of life. After the primeval physiolatry, which was common to all members of the Aryan family, had, in the hands of a wily priesthood, been changed into an empty idolatry, the Indian alone, of all the Aryan nations, produced a new form of religion, which has well been called subjective, as opposed to the more objective worship of nature. That religion, the religion of Buddha, has spread far beyond the limits of the Aryan world, and to our limited vision, it may seem to have retarded the advent of Christianity among a large portion of the human race. But in the sight of Him, with whom a thousand years are but as one day, that religion, like all the ancient religions of the world, may have but served to prepare the way of Christ, by helping through its very errors, to strengthen and to deepen the ineradicable yearning of the human heart after the truth of God." §

• Is not this Christian prejudice? Nor is this Max Muller alone. Even more strongly does this remark hold good of Monier Williams, whose very object, in writing the book, known as "Indian Wisdom," is to caricature the Vedic religion which he calls by the name of Brahminism, and to hoist up Christianity by the meritorious process of deliberate contrasts. Writes Monier Williams, "It is one of the aims, then, of the following pages to indicate the points of contact between Christianity and the three chief *false religions* of the world, as they are thus represented in India." †

---

§ Max Muller's *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* pp. 31—32,

† Monier William's *Indian Wisdom*, Introduction, p. 36.



Speaking of Christianity and its claims 'as supernaturally communicated by the Common Father of mankind for the good of all His creatures, he says—

"Christianity asserts that it effects its aim through nothing short of an entire change of the whole man, and a complete renovation of his nature. The means by which this renovation is effected may be described as a kind of *mutual transfer* or *substitution*, leading to a reciprocal interchange and co-operation between God and man's nature acting upon each other. Man—the Bible affirms—was created in the image of God, but his nature became corrupt through a taint, derived from the fall of the first representative man and parent of the human race, which taint could only be removed by a vicarious death.

"Hence, the second representative man—Christ—whose nature was divine and taintless, voluntarily underwent a sinner's death, that the taint of the old corrupted nature transferred to him might die also. But this is not all. The great central truth of our religion lies not so much in the fact of Christ's death as in the fact of His *continued life* (Rom. viii. 34). The first fact is that He of His own free-will died; but the second and more important fact is that He rose again and lives eternally, that He may bestow life for death and a participation in His own divine nature in place of the taint which He has removed.

"This, then, is the reciprocal exchange which marks Christianity and distinguishes it from all other religions—an exchange between the personal man descended from a corrupt parent, and the personal God made man and becoming our second parent. We are separated from a rotten root, and are grafted into a living one. We part

with the corrupt will, depraved moral sense, and perverted judgment inherited from the first Adam, and draw re-creative force—renovated wills, fresh springs of wisdom, righteousness, and knowledge—from the ever-living divine stem of the second Adam, to which, by a simple act of faith, we are united. In this manner is the grand object of Christianity effected. Other religions have their doctrines and precepts of morality, which, if carefully detached from much that is bad and worthless, may even vie with those of Christianity. But Christianity has, besides all these, what other religions have not—a personal God, ever living to supply the free grace or regenerating Spirit by which human nature is re-created and again made Godlike, and through which man, becoming once again 'pure in heart,' and still preserving his own will, self-consciousness, and personality, is fitted to have access to God the Father, and dwell in His presence for ever.\*

Again, speaking of Brahminism, he says—

"As to Brahmanism, we must, in fairness, allow that, according to its more fully developed system, the aim of union with God is held to be effected by faith in an apparently personal good, as well as by works and by knowledge. And here some of the lines of Brahmanical thought seem to intersect those of Christianity. But the apparent personality of the various Hindu gods melts away, on closer scrutiny, into a vague spiritual essence. It is true that God becomes man and interposes for the good of men, causing a seeming combination of the human and divine—and an apparent interchange of action and even loving sympathy between the Creator

---

\* Monier William's Indian Wisdom Introduction, pp. XL—XLI.



and His creatures. But can there be any real interaction or co-operation between divine and human personalities when all personal manifestations of the Supreme Being—gods as well as men—ultimately merge in the Oneness of the Infinite, and nothing remains permanently distinct from Him? It must be admitted that most remarkable language is used of Krishna (Vishnu), a supposed form of the Supreme, as the source of all life and energy (see pp. 144-148, and see also pp. 456, 457); but if identified with the One God he can only, according to the Hindu theory, be the source of life in the sense of giving out life to re-absorb it into himself. If, on the other hand, he is held to be only an incarnation or manifestation of the Supreme Being in human form, then by a cardinal dogma of Brahmanism, so far from being a channel of life, his own life must be derived from a higher source into which it must finally be merged, while his claim to divinity can only be due to his possessing less of individuality as distinct from God than inferior creatures."†

And lastly in conclusion, he says—

"It is refreshing to turn from such unsatisfying systems, however interspersed with wise and even sublime sentiments, to the living energizing Christianity of European nations, however lamentably fallen from its true standard, or however disgraced by the inconsistencies and shortcomings of nominal adherents—possessors of its name and form without its power."

"In conclusion, let me note one other point which of itself stamps our religion as the only system adapted to

---

† Ibid pp. 44, 45.

the requirements of the whole human race—the only message of salvation intended by God to be gradually pressed upon the acceptance of all His intelligent creatures."—*Ibid*, p. 45.

It is clear, then, that Professor Monier Williams is labouring under hard Christian prejudices, and can not be viewed in any way as an unprejudiced, impartial student of the Vedas. No wonder then, if modern sophisticated philology, propped by the entire ignorance of the laws of interpretations of Vedic terms, and fed by the prejudices of Christian superstitions, should raise its head against Vedic philosophy and gain audience among European Christian nations or deluded educated natives of India who possess the high merit of being innocent, of any knowledge of Sanskrit language or literature.

But now to the subject. The first canon for the interpretation of Vedic terms, which is laid down by Yaska, the author of Nirukta, is that the Vedic terms are all *yaugika*\*. The fourth section of the first chapter of Nirukta opens with a discussion of this very subject. Yaska, Gargya, Shakatayana and all other Grammarians and Etymologists unanimously maintain that Vedic terms are all *yaugika*. But Yaska and

---

\* A *yaugika* term is one that has a derivative meaning, that is, one that only signifies the meaning of root together with the modifications affected by the affixes. In fact, the structural elements out of which the word is compounded, afford the whole and the only clue to the true signification of the word. The word is purely connotative.



Shakatayana also maintain that *rurhi*† terms are also *yaugika*, i. e., were originally framed from the roots; whereas, Gargya maintains that only *rurhi* terms are not *yaugika*. The section concludes with a refutation of the opinions of Gargya, establishing it as true that, all terms whether Vedic or *rurhi* are *yaugikas*. It is on this authority of the Nirukta that Patanjali quotes in his Mahabhashya the same opinion, and distinguishes the Vedic terms from *Rurhi* terms by the designation of *naigama*. Says Patanjali—

नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते व्याकरणे

शकटस्य च तोकमु

and a line before this नैगम एद्धिभवं हि सुसाध †

The sense of all this is, that all the *Rishis* and *Munis* ancient authors and commentators without exception, regard Vedic terms to be *yaugika*, whereas *laukika* terms are regarded by some as *rurhi* also.

This principle, the European scholars have entirely ignored, and hence have flooded their interpretations of the Vedas with forged or borrowed tales of mythology, with stories and anecdotes of historic or pre-historic personages. Thus, according to Dr. Muir, § the following historical personages are mentioned in

---

† A *rurhi* term is the name of a definite concrete object, where connotation of the word (as structurally determined) gives no clue to the object denoted by the word. Hence ordinarily it means a word of arbitrary significance.

‡ Mahabhashya, Chap. III, Sect. iii, Aph.

§ Muir's Sanskrit Texts, Vol. III, pp. 232—234.

the Rig Veda, the Rishis Kanvas, in i 47-2 ; Gotamas, in i 71-16 ; Gritsamadas, in ii 39-8 ; Bhrigavas, in IV 16-23 ; and Vrihaduktha, in X, 54-6. But what is the truth ! The words Kanva, and Gritsa only signify learned men in general (See Nighantu iii, 13) ; the word, Bhrigavaḥ only signifies men of intellect (See Nighantu iii, 5). The word Gotama signifies one who praises ; and Vrihaduktha is simply one whose *ukthas*, or knowledge of natural properties of objects is *vrihat* or complete. It is clear, then, that if this principle is once ignored, one is easily landed into anecdote of historical or per-historic personages. The same might be said of Max Muller discovering the story of *Shunah-shepa* in the Rig Veda. Shepa, which means contact, (Nirukta iii 2, (शेषः शेषते स्युः शति कर्मणो) being suffixed to शुनः, or शुन which means knowledge (शु शुचतेः शवतेर्वागति कर्मणः स्यात्) means one who has come into contact with knowledge i.e. a learned person. It shall appear, in the progress of this article, how *mantra* after *mantra* is misinterpreted by simply falsifying this law of *Nirukta*.

To an unprejudiced mind, the correctness of this law will never be doubtful. For, independently of the authority of *Nirukta*, the very antiquity of the Vedas is a clear proof of its words being *yaugika*. And even, Professor Max Muller, in his mythological moods, is compelled to confess at least concerning certain position of the Vedas, that their words are *yaugika*. Says he,—

“But there is a charm in these primitive strains discoverable in no other class of poetry. Every word



retains something of its radical meaning, every epithet tells; every thought, in spite of the most intricate and abrupt expressions, is, if we once disentangle it, true, correct, and complete."<sup>o</sup>

Further again, says Max Muller,—“Names...are to be found in the Veda as it were in a still fluid state. They never appear as *appellations* nor yet as *proper names*; they are organic, not yet broken or smoothed down.”<sup>o</sup>

Can there be anything clearer than this? The terms occurring in the Vedas are *yaugika*, because “they never appear as appellatives, nor yet as proper names,” and because “every word retains something of its radical meaning.” It is strange to find that the self-same Max Muller who has perceived the *yaugia* character, of words in some mantras of the Vedas, should deny the same characteristic to other portions of the Vedas. Having said that words are *yaugika* in these primitive strains, the Vedas, he proceeds to say,—“But this is not the case with all the poems of the Veda. It would be tedious to translate many specimens of what I consider the poetry of the secondary age, the Mantra period. These songs are generally intended for sacrificial purposes, they are loaded with technicalities, their imagery is sometimes more brilliant, but always less perspicuous, and many thoughts and expressions are clearly borrowed from earlier hymns.”† This he calls the Mantra period. The primitive strains belong to what is called the

---

\* Max Muller's History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, page 553.

\* Ibid, pp 755,

Max Muller's History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p, 558

*Chhandas* period. He describes the characteristics of the *Chhandas* period, as distinguished from the *Mantra* period, that has been above described; thus;—"There is no very deep wisdom in their teaching, their laws are simple, their poetry shows no very high flights of fancy, and their religion might be told in a few words. But what there is of their language, poetry and religion, has a charm which no other period of Indian literature possesses; it is spontaneous, original and truthful."† Professor Max Muller quotes the *Rig Veda*, vii. 77, as specimen hymn of the *Chhandas* period. Says he,—

"This hymn, addressed to dawn, is a fair specimen of the original simple poetry of the *Veda*. It has no reference to any special sacrifice, it contains no technical expressions, it can hardly be called a hymn, in our sense of the word. It is simply a poem expressing, without any efforts, without any display of far-fetched thought or brilliant imagery, the feelings of a man who has watched the approach of the dawn with mingled delight and awe, and who was moved to give utterance to what he felt, in measured language."\*

From these quotations, it will be clear that Professor Max Muller regards different portions of the *Vedas* belonging to different periods. There are some and earlier portions, (according to Max Muller's highly accurate calculations, the very exactness and infallibility of which Goldstucker bears ample testimony to) which he calls as belonging to the *Chhandas* period. The word *Chhanda*, in *laukika* Sanskrit, means spontaneity.

---

† Ibid, p. 526

\* History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 552.



Hence he regards Chhandas period to be the one, the hymns of which period only teach common things, are free from the flight of fancy, and are the spontaneous utterances of a simple (foolish) mind. The Mantra period (29,00 years older) is full of technicalities and descriptions of elaborate ceremonies. Now we ask what proof has Max Muller given to prove that the different portions of the Vedas belong to different periods. His proofs are only two. Firstly, the ill-conceived, confused idea of the difference between *Chhandas* and *Mantras*; and secondly, the different phases of thought represented by the two portions.

We will consider each of these reasons in details.

Says Yaska—

मन्त्रः मननात् कृदांसि छादनात् स्तोमः स्तवनात्  
यजुर्यजते साम संनितमृचा ॥ निरु० ७। १२ ॥

which means that there is no difference in the meaning of mantra and chhandas. The Veda is called the mantra, as through it one learns the true knowledge of all existences. The Veda is also called the chhandas, as it removes all ignorance, and brings one under the protection of true knowledge and happiness. Or more explicitly still, we read in the *Shatapatha*, VIII. 2.—

छन्दांसि व देवा वयोनाधाश्छदोभिर्होदं सर्वं दयुनं  
नदम् ॥

The *mantras* (*deva*) are called *Chhandas* for knowledge of all human conduct is bound up with them, It is through them that we learn all righteous conduct.

The *yangika* sense of the words will also lead to the same conclusion. *Mantra* may be derived from the root *man* to think, or *matr* to reveal the secret knowledge. Panini thus derives the word *chhandas* चन्द्रे रादेश्चकः ॥<sup>\*</sup> *Chhandas* is derived from the root *chadi* to delight or illumine. *Chhandas* is that the knowledge of which produces all delight or which illumines every thing, i.e., reveals its true nature.

The second reason of Max Muller for assigning different periods to different portions of the Vedas, is that there are two different phases of thought discoverable in the Vedas. The one is the truthful and simple phase of thought and corresponds to his *Chhandas* period. The other is the elaborate and technical phase of thought that corresponds to his *Mantra* period. But what proof has Max Muller to show that the hymns of his secondary period are full of elaborate and technical thought? Evidently this, that he interprets them thus. If his interpretations were proved to be wrong, his distinction of the two periods will also fall to the ground. Now, why does he interpret the hymns of the *mantra* period thus? Evidently, because on the authority of Sayana and Mahidhara, he takes the words of those *mantras* to signify technicalities, sacrifices, and artificial objects and ceremonies, or, in other words, he takes these words not in their *yangika*, but in their *rushi* sense. It is clear, then, that if Max Muller had kept in view the canon of interpretation given in Nirukta, that all Vedic words are *yangika*, he would not have fallen into the fallacious

---

\* Unadi Kosha, iv. 219.



and chronism of assigning different periods to different parts of the Vedas.

But there is another prejudice which is cherished by many scholars evidently under the impression of its being a well recognised scientific doctrine. It is that in the ruder stages of civilization when laws of nature are little known and but very little understood, when mankind has not enough of the experience of the world, strict methods of correct reasoning are very seldom observed. On the other hand, analogy plays a most important part in the performance of intellectual functions of man.

The slightest semblance, or visage of semblance, is enough to justify the exercise of analogy. The most palpable of the forces of nature impress the human mind in such a period of rude beginnings of human experience by motions mainly. The wind blowing, the fire burning a stone falling, or a fruit dropping, affects the senses essentially as moving. Now, throughout the range of conscious exertion of muscular power, *will* precedes motion, and, since even the most grotesque experience of a savage in this world assumes this knowledge, it is no great stretch of intellectual power to argue that these natural forces also, to which the sensible motions are due, are endowed with the faculty of will. The personification of the forces of nature being thus effected their deification soon follows. The overwhelming potency, the unobstructible might, and often the violence, with which, in the sight of a savage, these forces operate, strike him with terror, awe and reverence. A sense of his own weakness, humility and inferiority creeps over the savage mind, and, what was intellectually personified, becomes emotionally deified. According to this view, the Vedas

undoubtedly books of primitive times, consist of prayers from such an emotional character addressed to the forces of nature including wind and rain—prayers breathing passions of the savage for vengeance or for propitiation or in moments of poetic exaltation, hymns simply portraying the simple phenomena of nature in the personified language of mythology.

It is therefore more agreeable for these scholars to believe that the Vedas, no doubt books of primitive times, are records of the mythological lore of the ancient Aryans.

And since, even according to the confessions of Max Muller, higher truths of philosophy and monotheism are to be found here and there in the Vedas, it has become difficult to reconcile the mythological interpretations of the main part of the Vedas with the philosophical portions. Says Max Muller, "I add only one more hymn [Rig.X.121], in which the idea of one God is expressed with such power and decision that it will make us hesitate before we deny to the Aryan nations an instinctive monotheism."<sup>o</sup> It is therefore argued by some that the mythological portions are earlier than philosophical ones; for the primitive faith as already indicated is always mythology.

The fundamental error of this supposition lies in regarding a contingent conclusion as a necessary one; for although mythology may be the result of barbarous intellect and analogical reasoning, it is not necessarily

---

\* Max Muller's History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature pp. 568.



always so. It may even grow up as a degenerate, deformed and petrified remnant of a purer and truer religion. The history of religious practices, primarily designed to meet certain real wants, degenerating, after a lapse of time, on the cessation of those wants, into mere ceremonies and customs, is an ample testimony of the truth of the above remarks. Had the European scholars never come across the mythological commentaries of Sayana and Mahidhara, or the *Puranic* literature of post-vedic (nay anti-vedic) period, it would have been impossible for them, from the mere grounds of comparative mythology or Sanskrit philosophy, to alight on such interpretations of the Vedas as are at present current among them. May it not be, that the whole mythological fabric of the *Puranas*, later at they are, was raised long after the vitality of true Vedic philosophy had departed from their words in the sight of the ignorant pedants? Indeed, when one considers that the Upanishats inculcate that high philosophical monotheism, the parallel of which does not exist in the world—a monotheism, that can only be conceived after a full conviction in the uniformity of nature,—and that they together with the philosophical *Darshanas* all preceded the *Puranas*; when one considers all this, one can hardly resist the conclusion that at least in India, mythology rose as a rotten remnant of the old philosophical living religion of the Vedas. When through the ignorance of men, the *yaugika* meanings of the Vedic words were forgotten, and proper names interpreted instead, there grew up a morbid mythology, the curse of modern idolatrous India. That mythology may thus arise on account of the decay of the primitive meaning of old words, even Professor

Max Muller admits, when speaking of the degeneration of truth into mythology by a process, he styles '*dialectic growth and decay*' or dialectic life of religion, he says—

"It is well known that ancient languages are particularly rich in synonyms, or, to speak more correctly, that in them the same object is called by many names—is, in fact, polynymous. While in modern languages most objects have one name only, we find in ancient Sanskrit, in ancient Greek and Arabic, a large choice of words for the same subject. This is perfectly natural. Each name could express one side only of whatever had to be named, and, not satisfied with one partial name, the early framers of language produced one name after the other, and after a time retained those which seemed most useful for special purposes. Thus the sky might be called not only the brilliant, but the dark, the covering, the thundering, the rain-giving. This is the polyonymy of language, and it is what we are accustomed to call polytheism in religion."\* &c. &c. (pp. 276-277.)

Even, in the face these facts, European scholars are so very reluctant to leave their pre-conceived notions that, as an example of the same influence, Frederic Pincott writes to me from England:

"You are right in saying that the great commentators, now so much admired, had very little, if any, better means of knowledge on Vedic terminology than we have at present. And you are certainly right in treating the

---

\* Max Muller's Lectures on the Science of Religion pp. 276-277.



Puranas as very modern productions ; but you are wrong in deducing India's mythological notions from such recent works. The Rig Veda itself, undoubtedly the oldest book which India possesses, abounds in mythological matter."

Does "you are certainly right" and "you are wrong" amount to any proof of the Vedas abounding in mythology. But further he says, "after the great shock which the spread of Buddhism gave to the old Indian form of faith, the Brahmans began to make their faith seriously philosophical in the Darshanas. Of course, many bold philosophical speculations are found in the Upanishats and even in the Samhitas; but it was at the time of the Darshanas that the religion was placed on a really philosophical basis."

Nothing shows so great a disrespect towards the history of another nation as the above. One is indeed wonder-struck at the way in which European scholars mistrust Indian chronology, and force their hypothetical guess-work and conjecture before the world as a sound historical statement of facts. Who, that has impartially studied the *Darshana* literature, does not know that the *Darshanas* existed centuries before even the first word of Buddhism was uttered in India? Jaimini, Vyasa and Patanjali had gone by, Gautama, Kanad and Kapila were buried in the folds of oblivion when Buddhism sprang up in the darkness of ignorance. Even the great Shankara, who waged a manly war against Buddhism or Jainism, preached nearly 2200 years ago. Now this Shankara is a commentator on Vyasa Sutras, and was preceded by Gaudapada and

other Acharyas in his work. Generations upon generations, had passed away after the time of Vyasa when Shankara was born. Further, there is no event so certain in Indian history, as Mahabharata, which took place about 4900 years ago. The *Darshanas* therefore existed at least 4900 years ago. There is a strong objection against the admission of these facts by European scholars, and that objection is the Bible. For, if these dates be true, what will become of the account of creation as given in the Bible. It seems, besides, that European scholars, on the whole, are unfit to comprehend that there could be any disinterested literature in the past. It is easier for them to comprehend that political or religious revolutions or controversies should give rise to new literature through necessity. Hence the explanations of Mr. Pincott. The old Brahmans were superstitious, dogmatic believers in the revelations of the Vedas. When Buddhism spread like wild fire, they thought of shielding their religion by mighty arguments and hence produced the *Darshana* literature. This assumption so charmingly connects heterogeneous events together that although historically false, is it worth being believed in for the sake of its ingenious explanatory power.

To return to the subject. Yaska lays down a canon for the interpretation of Vedic terms. It is that the Vedic terms are *yaugika*. Mahabhashya repeats the same. We have seen how this law is set aside and ignored by the European scholars in the interpretations of the Vedas, whence have arisen serious mistakes in their translations of the Vedas. We have also seen



how Dr. Muir falling in the same mistake interprets general terms as proper nouns; and how Max Muller, also led by the same error, wrongly divides the Vedas into two parts; the Chhandas and the Mantras. We have also seen how, due to the ignorance of the same law, Mantras upon Mantras have been interpreted as mythological in meaning, whereas some few Mantras could only be interpreted philosophically, thus giving rise to the question of reconciling philosophy with mythology. To further illustrate the importance of the proposition, that all Vedic terms are *yangika*, I herewith subjoin the true translation of the 4th Mantra of the 50th Sukta of the Rig Veda, with my comment thereon and the translation of the same by Monier Williams for comparison. Surya, as a *yangika* word, means both the sun and the Divinity. Monier Williams takes it to represent the sun only. Other terms will become explicit in the course of exposition. The Mantra runs as follows:

तरणि॑ वि॒श्वद॑र्श॒तो ज्यो॑तिष्कृ॒दसि॑ सूर्य॑ ।

वि॒श्वमा॑ भा॒सि रो॒चनं॑ ॥

The subject is the gorgeous wonders of the solar and the electric worlds. "A grand problem is here propounded in this Mantra. Who is here that is not struck with the multiplicity of objects and appearances? Who that has not lost thought itself in contemplation of the infinite varieties that inhabit even our own planet? Even the varieties of plant life have not yet been counted. The number of animal and plant species together with

the vast number of mineral compounds may truly be called infinite? But why confine ourselves to this earth alone. Who has counted the host of heavens, and the infinity of stars, the innumerable number of worlds yet made, and still remaining to be made? What mortal eye can measure and scan the depths of space? Light travels at the rate of 180,000 miles per second. There are stars from which rays of light have started on their journey ever since the day of creation, hundreds of years ago, the rays have sped on and on with the unearthly velocity of 180,000 miles per second through space, and have only now penetrated into the atmosphere of our earth. Imagine the infinite depth of space with which we are on all sides surrounded. Are we not struck with variety and diversity in every direction? Is not differentiation the universal formula? Whence have these manifold and different objects of the universe proceeded? How is it that the same Universal-Father-spirit permeating in all and acting on all produced these heterogeneous items of the universe? Where lies the cause of difference? A difference so striking and at once so beautiful? How can the same God acting upon the universe produce an earth here and a sun there, a planet here and a satellite there, an ocean here and a dry land there, nay a Swami here and an idiot there? The answer to this question is impressed in the very solar constitution. Scientific philosophers assure us that colour is not an intrinsic property of matter, a popular belief would have it. But it is an accident of matter. A red object appears red not because it



is essentially so, but because of an extraneous cause. Red and violet would appear equally black when placed in the dark. It is the magic of sunbeams which imparts to them this special influence, this chromatic beauty, this congenial coloration. In a lonely forest mid gloom and wilderness, a weary traveller who had betaken himself to the alluring shadow of a pompous tree, lay down to rest and there sunk in deep slumber. He awoke, and found himself enveloped in gloom and dismal darkness on all sides. No earthly object was visible on either side. A thick black firmament on high, so beclouded as to inspire with the conviction that the sun had never shone there, a heavy gloom on the right, a gloom on the left, a gloom before and a gloom behind. Thus labored the traveller under the ghastly, frightful wind-spell of frozen darkness. Immediately, the heat-carrying rays of the sun struck upon the massive cloud, and as if by a magic touch, the frozen gloom began to melt, a heavy shower of rain fell down. It cleared the atmosphere of suspended dust particles; and in the twinkling of an eye fled the moisture-laden sheet of darkness resigning its realm to awakened vision entire. The traveller turned his eyes in ecstatic wonder from one direction to the other, and beheld a dirty gutter flowing there, a crystalline pond reposing here, a green glass meadow more beautiful than violet plant on one side, and a cluster of variegated fragrant flowers on the other. The feathery creation with peacock's train, and deer with slender legs, and chirrup of birds with plumage lent from Heaven, all, in fact all, darted into vision.

Was there naught before the sun had shone? Had verdant forest, rich with luxuriant vegetation, and filled with the music of birds, all grown in a moment? Where lay the crystalline waters? Where the blue canopy, where the fragrant flower? Had they been transported there by some magical power in the twinkling of an eye from dark dim distant regions of chaos? No! they did not sprung up in a moment. They were already there. But the sunbeams had not shed their lustre on them. It required the magic of the lustrous sun to shine, before scenes of exquisite beauty could dart into vision. It required the luminous rays of the resplendent orb to shed their influence, ere before the eyes could roll in beautiful chant, the harmonious, reposeful and refreshing scenes of fragrant green. Yes, thus, even thus is this sublimely attractive Universe, रोचनं विश्वं illuminated by a sun सूर्यआभासि, the Sun that knows no setting, the Sun that caused our planets and the solar orb to appear जगोयिष्क द् the Sun that evolves the panorama of this grand creation, विश्वदर्शत the eternal Sun ever existing through eternity in perpetual action for the good of all. He sheds the rays of His wisdom all around; the deeply thirsty, and parching, blast-dried atoms of matter drank in to satiation, from the ever-flowing, ever-gushing, ever illuminating rays of 'Divine wisdom' their appropriate elements and essence, of phenomenal existence, and panoramic display. Thus is this universe sustained. One central sun producing infinity of colours. One central Divinity, producing



infinity of worlds and objects. Compare with this Monier William's translation.

"With speed beyond the ken of mortals, thou, O sun,  
Dost ever travel on, conspicuous to all.

Thou dost create the light, and with it illumine  
The entire universe."

We have shown why we regard *Chhandas* and *Mantra* as synonymous. We have also seen how Max Muller distinguishes between *Chhandas* and *Mantra*, regarding the latter as belonging to the secondary age, as loaded with technicalities, and as being less perspicuous than the former. He points out its chief character to be that "these songs are generally intended for sacrificial purposes." Concerning this *Mantra* period, he says, "One specimen may suffice, a hymn describing the sacrifice of the horse with the full detail of a superstitious ceremonial (Rig Veda i. 162)."

We shall therefore quote the 162nd Sukta of Rig-veda, as it is the specimen hymn of Max Muller, with his translation, and show how, due to a defective knowledge of Vedic literature and to the rejection of the principle that Vedic terms are all *yaugika*, Professor Max Muller translates a purely scientific hymn, distinguishable in no characteristics from the *chhandas* of the Vedas, as representative of an *artificial cumbersome* and *highly superstitious* ritual or ceremonial.

To our thinking, Muller's interpretation is so very incongruous, unintelligible, and perfunctory, that were the interpretation even regarded as *possible*, it could never be conceived as the description of an *actual* ceremonial. And now to the hymn. The first *Mantra* runs thus :—

मीनो मित्रो वरुणो अर्यमायु-  
 रिन्द्र ऋभुक्षा मरुतः परिख्यन् ।  
 यद्वाजिनो देव जातस्य सप्तः  
 प्रवक्ष्यामो विदधे वीर्याणि ॥ १ ॥

Max Muller translates it, "May Mitra, Varuna, Aryaman, Ayu, Indra, the lord of the Ribhus, and the Maruts, not rebuke us, because we shall proclaim at the sacrifice the virtues of the swift horse sprung from the gods."

That the above interpretation may be regarded as real or as true, let Professor Max Muller prove that Aryans of the Vedic times entertained the superstition that at least one swift horse had sprung from the gods, also that the gods Mitra, Varuna, Aryaman, Ayu, Indra the lord of Ribhus and the Maruts, did not like to hear the virtues of the swift horse proclaimed at the sacrifice. for if otherwise, they would have no reason to rebuke the poet. Not one of these positions it is ever possible to entertain with validity. Even the most diseased conception of a savage shrinks from such a superstition as the "swift horses sprung from the gods." It is also in vain to refer for the verification of this position to the *ashwamedha* of the so-called *Puranas*. The whole truth is that this mythology of *ashwamedha* arose in the same way in which originates Max Muller's translation. It originates from an ignorance of the dialectic laws of the Vedas, when words having a *yangika* sense are taken for proper nouns, and an imaginary mythology started.



To take, for instance, the *mantra* quoted above. Max Muller is evidently under 'the impression that Mitra is the 'god of the day,' Varuna, is the god of the 'investing sky,' Vayu or Ayu is the 'god of the wind,' Indra the 'god of the watery atmosphere,' Ribhus, 'the celestial artists,' and Maruts are the 'storm-gods.' But why these gods? Because he ignores the *yangika* sense of these words and takes them as proper nouns. Literally speaking, *mitra* means a friend; *varuna*, a man of noble qualities; *aryama*, a judge or administrator of justice; *ayu*, a learned man; *indra* a governor; *ribhuksha*, a wise man; *marutah*, those who practically observe the laws of seasons. The word *ashwa* which occurs in the *mantra* does not mean 'horse' only, but it also means the group of three forces, heat electricity and magnetism. It, in fact, means anything that can carry soon through a distance. Hence writes Swami Dayananda in the beginning of this Sukta :

अथाश्वस्य विद्युद् रूपेण व्याप्तस्याग्नेः सविद्यामह ॥

"This Sukta is an exposition of *ashwa vidya* which means the science of training horses & the science of heat which pervades everywhere in the shape of electricity." That *ashwa* means heat will be clear from the following quotations.

अश्वं न त्वा वारवन्तं विदध्या अग्निं नमोभिः ॥

Rig Veda.

The words *ashwam agnim* show that *ashwa* means *agni* or heat. And further—

वृषो अग्निः समिद्धातेऽश्वो न देववाहनः ।

तं हविष्मन्त ईडते ॥ Rig Veda i, 27, 1.

which means *agni*, the *ashwa*, carries like an animal of conveyance the learned who thus recognize its distance-carrying properties. Or further,

वृषो अग्निः । अश्वो ह वा एष भूत्वा देवेभ्यो यज्ञं वहति॥

Shatapatha Brahman, I, iii, 3, 29, 30.

The above quotations are deemed sufficient to show both meanings of *ashwa* above indicated.

Professor Max Muller translates the "*devajata*" of the *mantra* as "sprung from the gods." This is again wrong, for he again takes *deva* in its popular *laukika* sense, god ; whereas *devajata* means "with brilliant qualities manifested or evoked to work by learned men" : the word *deva* meaning both brilliant qualities and learned men. Again Max Muller translates "*virya*" merely in to virtues, instead of "power-generating virtues." The true meaning of the *mantra*, therefore, is this :—

"We will describe the power-generating virtues of the energetic horses endowed with brilliant properties, or the virtues of the vigorous force of heat which learned or scientific men can evoke to work for purposes of appliances (not sacrifice). Let not philanthropes, noble men, judges, learned men, rulers, wise men & practical mechanics ever disregard these properties," with which compare Max Muller's translation.

"May Mitra, Varuna, Ar yaman, Ayu, Indra, the lord of Ribhus and the Maruts not rebuke us, because we shall proclaim at the sacrifice the virtues of the swift horse sprung from the gods."

We come now to the second *mantra* which runs thus :



यन्निर्णिजारेक्णसा प्रावृतस्य

रातिं गृभीतां मुखतो नयन्ति ।

सुपाङ्गो मेमरद्विगुरूप

इन्द्रापूष्णोः प्रियमप्येति पाथः ॥ २ ॥

Max Muller translates it thus—

“When they lead before the horse, which is decked with pure gold ornaments, the offering, firmly grasped the spotted goat bleats while walking onwards; it goes the path beloved by Indra and Pushan.”

Here again there is no sense in the passage. The bleating of the goat has no connection with the leading of the offering before the horse, nor any with its walking onward. Nor is the path of Indra and Pushan in any way defined. In fact, it is very clear that there is no definite specific relation between the first *mantra* and this, according to Muller's translation, unless a far-fetched connection be forced by the imagination bent to discover or invent some curious, inconceivable mythology. And now to the application of the principle that all Vedic terms are *yaugika*. Max Muller translates *reknasas* into gold ornaments, whereas it only means wealth (see *Nighantu*, ii. 10). *Rati* which signifies the mere act of giving is converted into an ‘offering;’ *vishvarupa* which only means one ‘having an idea of all forms’ is converted into ‘spotted;’ *aji* which means ‘a man once born in wisdom, being never born again’ is converted into a ‘goat’ *memyat*, from root *mi* to injure is given to mean ‘bleating’ *aprang*, which means, from root *prach* to question, ‘one

who is able enough to put questions elegantly,' is translated as walking onward'; *pathah* which only means drink or food, is translated into 'path'; and lastly, *indra* and *pushan* instead of meaning the governing people and the strong are again made to signify two deities with their proper names 'Indra' and 'Pushan.' Concerning the word *pathah* writes Yaska, vi. 7.

पाथोऽन्तरिचं । उदकमपि पाथ उच्यते एनात् ।

अन्न मपि पाथ उच्यते पानादेव ॥

*Mukhato nayanti*, which means 'they bring out of the organ of speech, or they explain or preach,' is translated by Max Muller into 'they lead before'.

It is thus clear that, in this *one mantra* alone, there are nine words that have been wrongly translated by Max Muller, and all is due to this that the *yaugika* sense of the words has been ignored, the *ruhî* or the *laukika* sense being everywhere forced in the translation. The translation of the *mantra*, according to the sense of the words we have given, will be—

"They who preach that only wealth earned by righteous means should be appropriated and spent, and those born in wisdom who are well versed in questioning others elegantly in the science of forms, and in the correcting the unwise, these and such alone drink the potion of strength and of power to govern."

The connection of this *mantra* with the foregoing is that the *ashwa vidya*, spoken of in the first *mantra* should be practiced only by those who are possessed of righteous



means, are wise, and have the capacity to govern and control.

We come now to the 3rd *mantra* of 162nd Sukhta.—

एष ह्यागः पुरो अश्वेन वाजिना  
पूष्णो भागो नीयते विश्वदेव्यः ।

अभिप्रियं यत्पु रोडाशमर्वता  
त्वष्टेदेनं सौश्रवसाय जनुति ॥ ३ ॥

Max Muller translates it thus :—

"This goat, destined for all the gods, is led first with the quick horse, as Pushan's share; for Tvashtri himself raises to glory this pleasant offering which is brought with the horse."

Here, again, we find the same artificial stretch of imagination which is the characteristic of this translation. How can the goat be 'destined for all the gods,' and at the same time be 'Pushan's share' alone? Here Max Muller gives a reason for the goat being led first as Pushan's share; the reason is that Tvashtri himself raises to glory this pleasant offering. Now who is this Tvashtri and how is he related to Pushan? All these are questions left to be answered by the blank imagination of the reader. Such a translation can only do one service. It is that of making fools of the Vedic *rishis* whom Max Muller supposes to be authors of the Vedas.

The word *vishwadevyas*, which Max Muller translates as 'destined for all the gods,' can never grammatically mean so. The utmost that one can make for Max Muller on this word is that *vishwadeva* should mean 'for all the

*devas*, but 'destined' is a pure addition unwarranted by grammar. *Vishwadevya* is formed from *vishwadeva* by the addition of the suffix *yat* in the sense of *tatra sadhu* (see *Ashtadhyayi*, IV. 4. 98). The meaning is

विश्वेषु देवेषु दिव्यगुणेषु साधुर्विश्वदेव्यः

or *Vishwadevyas* is whatsoever is *par excellence* fit to produce useful properties. We have spoken of Max Muller translating *pushan*, which means strength, into a proper noun. *Tvashtri*, which simply means one who befits things, or a skilful hand, is again converted into a proper noun. *Purodasha* which means food well-cooked, is translated into offering. The words 'which is brought with' are, of course, Max Muller's addition to put sense into what would otherwise be without any sense. *Arvat* which, no doubt, sometimes means a horse, here means knowledge. For if horse were intended, some adjective of significance would have so changed the meaning. *Sau-shravasaya Jinivati* which means "obtains for purpose of good food," *Shravas*, in Vedic Sanskrit, meaning food or *anna*) is translated by Max Muller into 'raises to glory. The true meaning would be. "The goat possessed of useful properties yields milk as a strengthening food for horses. The best cereal is useful when made into pleasant food well prepared by an apt cook according to the modes dictated by specific knowledge of the properties of foods."

We have criticised Max Muller's translation of the first three *mantras* of this *sukta* in detail, to show how he errs at every step; in every case, the error consisting in taking the *rurhi* meaning instead of the *yangika* one of the word



It will not difficult to pass from *mantra* to *mantra* till the hymn is finished, and show that the true origin of all errors lies in not recognising the *yaugika* sense of Vedic terms. But we deem the above three *mantras* as sufficient. We, however, subjoin herewith Max Muller's translation of the remaining *mantras* of this hymn, with our occasional remarks in the foot-notes.

Max Muller's translation :—

4. When thrice at the proper seasons, men lead around the sacrificial horse which goes to the gods, Pushan's share comes first, the goat, which announces the sacrifice ° to the gods.

5. Hotri adhvaryu, Avaya (Pratiprasthatri), Agnimindha (agnidhra), Gravagrabha (Gravastut), and the wise Sanstri (Prasastri), may you fill the streams (round the altar) with a sacrifice which is well prepared and well accomplished. †

6. They who cut the sacrificial post, and they who carry it, they who make the ring for the past of the horse and even they who bring together what is cooked for the horse, may their work be with us.

7. He came on—(my prayer has been well performed) the bright backed horse goes to the region of the gods.

---

\* The word *yajna* which originally indicates any action requiring association of men or objects, and productive of beneficial results, is always translated by European scholars as sacrifice. The notion of sacrifice is a purely Christian notion, and has no place in Vedic philosophy. It is foreign to the genuine religion of India. Hence all translations in which the word sacrifice occurs are to be rejected as fallacious.

† Max Muller herein puts five words as proper nouns, and therefore does not accept their *yaugika* sense. The word 'round the altar' are supplied by Muller's imagination on the ground that sacrifices are conducted at the altar. Both ideas are foreign to Vedic philosophy. DBAC

Wise poets celebrate him, and we have won a good friend for the love of the gods.

8. The halter of the swift one, the heel-ropes of the horse, the head-ropes, the girths, bridle, and even the grass that has been put into his mouth, may all these which belong to thee be with the gods.

9. What the fly eats of the flesh what adheres to the stick, or to the axe, or to the hand of the immolator and his nails, may all these which belong to thee be with the gods. \*

10. The ordure that runs from the belly, and the smaller particles of raw flesh, may the immolators well prepare all this, and dress the sacrifice till it is well-cooked. †

11. The juice that flows from thy roasted limb on the spit after thou hast been killed, may it not run on the earth, or the grass; may it be given to the gods who desire it. ‡

\* Here Max Muller does not understand the structure of the sentence. The original words are *ashvasya kravisho* which he takes to mean the flesh of the horse, but *kravisho* is an adjective qualifying *ashvasya*, the whole really means of the pacing horse. *Kravisho* does not mean 'of the flesh' but 'pacing' from the root *kram* to pace. The meaning would be. "What the fly eats of whatever dirty adheres to the horse" &c. Again the words *swarau* & *swadhitau* are translated into stick & axe, which is never their meaning.

† *Amasya kravisho* which means 'raw food yet undigested and disposed to come out' is similarly translated by Muller into raw flesh here. *Ama* is the state of the undigested food in the belly. Here again Muller does not follow the structure of the *mantra*.

‡ *Agnina pachyamanad* which means 'forced by the heat of anger, is translated by Muller as roasted; and *hatasya*' which means propelled is here translated by Muller as "killed."



12. They who examine the horse when it is roasted, they who say "it smells well, take it away," they who serve the distribution of the meat, may their work also be with us. §

13. The ladle of the spot where the meat is cooked, and the vessels for sprinkling the juice, the vessels to keep off the heat, the covers of the vessels, the skewers, and the knives, they adorn the horse.

14. Where he walks, where he sits, where he stirs, the foot-fastening of the horse, what he drinks, & what food he eats, may all these which belong to thee, be with the gods!

15. May not the fire with smoky smell make thee hiss, may not the glowing cauldron swell and burst. The gods accept the horse if it is offered to them in due form.

16. The cover which they stretch over the horse, and the golden ornaments, the head-ropes of the horse, and the foot-ropes, all these which are dear to the gods, they offer to them.

17. If some one strike thee with the heel or the whip that thou mayst lie down, and thou art snorting with all thy might, then I purify all this with my prayer, as with a spoon of clarified butter at the sacrifice.

18. The axe approaches the 34 ribs of the quick horse, beloved of gods. Do you wisely keep the limbs whole, find out each joint and strike. \*

---

§ The translation of this mantra is especially noteworthy. The word *vajinam* from *vaja* cereals, is here taken as meaning horse, and Professor Max Muller is so anxious to bring forth the sense of the sacrifice of the horse that, not content with this, he interprets *mansa bhiksham upasate*, which means 'he serves the absence of meat' into 'he serves the meat. Can there be anything more questionable?

\* The number of ribs mentioned by Muller is worth being counted and verified. *Vankri* which means 'a zigzag motion' is here translated as 'rib.' This requires proof.

19. One strikes the brilliant horse, two hold it, thus is the custom. Those of thy limbs which I have seasonably prepared, I sacrifice in the fire as balls offered to the gods. †

20. May not thy dear soul burn thee, while thou art coming near, may the axe not stick to thy body. May no greedy and unskillful immolator, missing with the sword, throw thy mangled limbs together.

21. Indeed thou diest not thus, thou sufferest not; thou goest to the gods on easy paths.

The two horses of Indra, the two deer of the Maruts have been yoked, and the horse comes to the shaft of the ass (of the aswins). ‡

22. May this horse give us cattle and horses, men's progeny and all sustaining wealth. May Aditi keep us from sin, may the horse of this sacrifice give us strength."—pp. 553—554.

We leave now Max Muller and his interpretations, and come to another commentator of the Vedas, Sayana. Sayana may truly be called the father of European Vedic scholarship. Sayana is the author from whose voluminous commentaries the Europeans have drunk in the deep

---

† *Twashṭu rashwoṣya* is here translated as 'brilliant horse,' as if *ashva* were the noun and *twashṭa* its qualifying adjective. The reverse is the truth. *Twashṭa* is the noun signifying electricity, and *ashwa* is the qualifying adjective signifying all pervading. The words, "offered to the gods," in the end of the translation are pure addition of Max Muller, to give the whole a mythological coloring.

‡ *Hari* is again as a *ruṛhi* word translated into two horses of Indra and *prishati* into two deer of *maruts*. The 'shaft of the ass' is perhaps the greatest curiosity, Max Muller could present, as a sign of mythology.



wells of mythology. It is upon the interpretation of Madhava Sayana that the translations of Wilson, Benfey and Llanglois are based. It is Sayana whose commentaries are appealed to in all doubtful cases. "If a dwarf on the shoulders of a giant can see further than the giant, he is no less a dwarf in comparison with the giant." If modern exegetes and lexicographers standing at the top of Sayana, i. e., with their main knowledge of the Vedas, borrowed from Sayana, should now exclaim, "Sayana intimates only that sense of the Vedas which was current in India some centuries ago, but comparative philology gives us that meaning which the poets themselves gave to their songs and phrases;" or if they should exclaim that they have the great advantage of putting together ten or twenty passages for examining the sense of a word which occurs in them, which Sayana had not: nothing is to be wondered at. Madhava Sayana, the voluminous commentator of 'all the Vedas, of the most important Brahmanas and a Kalpa work, the renowned *Mimamsist*,—he, the great grammarian, who wrote the learned commentary on Sanskrit radicals: yes, he is still a model of learning and a colossal giant of memory, in comparison to our modern philologists and scholars. Let modern scholars, therefore, always bear in mind, that Sayana is the life of their scholarship, their comparative philology and their so much boasted interpretation of the Vedas. And if Sayana was himself diseased—whatsoever the value of the efforts of modern scholars'—their comparative philology, their new interpretations, and their so-called marvellous achievements cannot but be diseased. Doubt not that the vitality of modern comparative philo-

logy and Vedic scholarship is wholly derived from the diseased and defective victuals of Sayana's learning. Sooner or later, the disease will develop its final symptoms and sap the foundation of the very vitality it seemed to produce. No branch of a tree can live or flourish when separated from the living stock. No interpretations of the Vedas will, in the end, ever succeed unless they are in accord with the living sense of the Vedas in the Nirukta and the Brahmanas.

I quote here a *mantra* from Rigveda, and will show how Sayana's interpretation radically differs from the explanation of the Nirukta. The *mantra* is from the Rigveda, ix. 96. It runs thus:—

ब्रह्मा देवानां पदवीः काशीनाम्

ऋषिर्विप्राणां महिषो मृगाणाम् ।

श्वेनो मृगानां स्वधितिर्वनानां

सोमः पवित्रमत्येति रेभन् ॥

Says Sayana :—

"God Himself appears as Brahma among the gods, Indra, Agni, &c; He appears as a poet among the dramatists and writers of lyrics; He appears as Vashishtha, &c. among the Brahmanas; He appears as a buffalo among quadrupeds; He appears as an eagle among birds; He appears as an axe in the forest; He appears as the *soma* juice purified by *mantras* excelling in its power of purification, the sacred waters of the Ganges, &c., &c."

The translation bears the stamp of the time when it was produced. It is the effort of a Pandit to establish his



name by appealing to popular prejudice and feeling. Evidently, when Sayana wrote, the religion of India was "pantheism" or everything is God; evidently, superstition had so far increased that the waters of the Ganges were regarded as sacred; incarnations were believed in; the worship of Brahma, Vasishtha and other *rishes* was at its acme. It was probably the age of the dramatists and poets, Sayana was himself a resident of some city or town. He was not a villager. He was familiar with the axe as an instrument of the destruction of forests, &c., but not with the lightning or fire as a similar but more powerful agent. His translation does not mirror the sense of the Vedas but his own age. His interpretation of *brahma*, *kavi*, *deva*, *rishi*, *vipra*, *mahisha*, *mriga*, *shyena*, *gridhra*, *vana*, *soma*, *pavitra*—of all these words, without one exception, is purely *rurhi* or *laukika*.

Now follows the exposition of Yaska in his Nirukta, xiv. 13. There is not a single word that is not taken in its *yaugika* sense. Says Yaska:

अथाध्यात्मं ब्रह्मादेवानामित्ययमपि ब्रह्मा भवति  
देवानां देवनकर्मणामिन्द्रियाणां देवोः कवीनामित्यपि  
पठं वेत्ति कवीनां कवीयमानानामिन्द्रियाणां मृषि-  
र्विप्राणामित्ययमप्यृषिणो भवति विप्राणां व्यापन-  
कर्मणामिन्द्रियाणां महिषो मृगाणामित्ययमपि  
महान् भवति मार्गणकर्मणामिन्द्रियाणां श्येनो गृ-  
ध्रानामिति श्येन आत्मा भवति श्यायते ज्ञान कर्मणो

मृधाणीन्द्रियाणि मृधते ज्ञानं कर्मणो यत एत-  
 स्मिंस्तिष्ठति स्वधितिर्वनानामित्ययमपि स्वयं कर्मा-  
 न्यात्मनि धत्ते वनानां वननं कर्मणामिन्द्रियाणां  
 सोमः पवित्रमत्येति सूयमानो ऽयमेवैतत् सर्वमनु-  
 भवत्यात्मगतिमाचष्टे ।

We will now speak of the spiritual sense of the *mantra* as Yaska gives it. It is his object to explain that the human spirit is its central conscious being that enjoys all experience. The external world as revealed by the senses finds its purpose and object and therefore absorption in this central being. The *indriyas* or the senses are called the *devas*, because they have their play in the external phenomenal world and because it is by them that the external world is revealed to us. Hence *Atma*, the human spirit, is the *brahma devanam*, the conscious entity that presents to its consciousness all that the senses reveal. Similarly, the senses are called the *kavayah*, because one learns by their means. The *Atma*, then, is *padavi kavinam*, or the true sentient being that understands the working of the senses. Further, the *Atma* is *rishir vipranam*, the cognizers of sensations; *vipra* meaning the senses as the feelings excited by them pervade the whole body. The senses are also called the *mrigas*, for they hunt about their proper aliment in the external world. *Atma* is *mahisho mriganam*, i.e., the great of all the hunters. The meaning is that it is really through the power of *Atma* that the senses are enabled to find out their proper objects. The *Atma* is called *shyenas*, as to it belongs



the power of realization ; & *gridhras* are the *indriyas*, for they provide, the material for such realization. The *Atma*, then, pervades these senses. Further, this *Atma* is *swadhitir vananam*, or the master, whom all *indriyas* serve. *Swadhiti* means *Atma*, for the activity of *Atma* is all for itself, man being an end unto himself. The senses are called *vana*, for they serve their master, the human spirit. It is this *Atma* that being pure in its nature, enjoys all. Such, then, is the *yaugika* sense which Yaska attaches to the *mantra*. Not only is it all consistent and intelligible unlike Sayana's, which conveys no actual sense ; not only is each word clearly defined in its *yaugika* meaning ; in contradistinction with Sayana who knows no other sense of the word than the popular one ; but there is also to be found that simplicity, naturalness and truthfulness of meaning, rendering it independent of all time and space, which contrasted with the artificiality, burdensomeness and localisation of Sayana's sense, can only proclaim Sayana's complete ignorance of the principles of Vedic interpretation.

This is Sayana, upon whose commentaries of the Vedas are based the translations of European scholars.

We leave now Max Muller and Sayana with their *rurhi* translations and come to another question, which though remotely connected with the one just mentioned, is yet important enough to be separately treated. It is the question concerning the *Religion of the Vedas*. European scholars and idolatrous superstitious Hindus are of opinion that the Vedas inculcate the worship of innumerable gods and goddesses, *Devatas*. This word, *devatas*, is a most fruitful source of error, and it is very

necessary that its exact meaning and application should be determined. Not understanding the Vedic sense of this word, *devata*, and easily admitting the popular superstitious interpretation of a belief in mythological gods and goddesses, crumbling into wretched idolatry, European scholars have imagined the Vedas to be full of the worship of such materials, and have gone so far in their reverence for the Veda as to degrade its religion even below polytheism and perhaps at par with atheism. In their fit of benevolence, the European scholars have been gracious enough to endow this religion with a title, a name, and that is Henotheism.

After classifying into polytheistic, dualistic & monotheistic, remarks Max Muller, "It would certainly be necessary to add two other classes—the *henotheistic* & the *atheistic*. Henotheistic religions differ from polytheistic, because although they recognize the existence of various deities or names of deities, they represent each deity as independent of all the rest, as the only deity present in the mind of the worshipper at the time of his worship and prayer. *This character is very prominent in the religion of the Vedic poets.* Although many gods are invoked in different hymns, sometimes also in the same hymn, yet there is no rule of precedence established among them; and according to the varying aspects of nature, and the varying craving of human heart, it is sometimes Indra, the god of the blue sky, sometimes Agni, the god of fire sometimes Varuna, the ancient god of the firmament, who are praised as supreme without any suspicion of rivalry, or any idea of subordination. This peculiar phase of



religion, this worship of single gods, forms probably everywhere the first stage in the growth of polytheism, and deserves therefore a separate name.\*

To further illustrate the principles of this new religion, henotheism, says Max Muller, "When these individual gods are invoked, they are not conceived as limited by the power of others as superior or inferior in rank. Each God is to the mind of the suppliant as good as all the gods. He is felt, at the time, as a real divinity, as supreme and absolute, in spite of the necessary limitation which, to our mind, a plurality of gods must entail on every single god. All the rest disappear for a moment from the vision of the poet, and he only who is to fulfill their desires stands in full light before the eyes of the worshippers. "Among you, O Gods, there is none that is small, none that is young; you are all great indeed," is a sentiment which, though perhaps, not so distinctly expressed as by ManuVaivasvata, nevertheless, underlies all the poetry of the Veda. Although the gods are sometimes distinctly invoked as the great and the small, the young and the old (Rv.i.27-13), this is only an attempt to find out the most comprehensive expression for the divine powers, and nowhere is any of the gods represented as the slave of others."

As an illustration," when Agni, the lord of fire, is addressed by the poet, he is spoken of as the first god, not inferior even to Indra. While Agni is invoked, Indra

---

\* Max Muller : Lectures on the Science of Religion, London 1873, pp. 141-142.

is forgotten ; there is no competition between the two, nor any rivalry between them and other gods. This is a most important feature in the religion of the Veda, and has never been taken into consideration by those who have written on the history of ancient polytheism.”†

We have seen what Max Muller’s view of the Religion of the Veda is. We may be sure that the view of other European scholars also cannot be otherwise. Is henotheism really, then, the religion of the Vedas? Is the worship of *devatas* an essential feature of Vedic worship? Are we to believe Max Muller, and assert that the nation to which he hesitates to deny instinctive monotheism has so far uprooted its instincts as to fall down to an acquired belief in henotheism? Nay, not so. The Vedas, the sacred books of the primitive Aryans, are the purest record of the highest form of monotheism possible to conceive. Scholars cannot long continue to misconstrue the Vedas, and ignore the laws of their interpretation. Says Yaska:—

अथातो दैवतं तद्यानि नामानि प्राधान्यस्तुतीनां  
देवतानां तद्दैवतमित्या चक्षते सैषा देवतोपपरीक्षा  
यत्काम ऋषिर्यस्यां देवतायामर्थपत्यमिच्छन् स्तुतिं  
प्रयुङ्क्ते तदैवतः स मन्त्रो भवति ॥ Nirukta vii. 1.

‘*Daivata* is a general term applied to those substances whose attributes are explained in a *mantra*.’ The sense of the above is that when it is known which substance it

---

† Max Muller : History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, pp. 552-553.



is that forms the subject of exposition in the *mantra*, the term signifying that substance is called the *devatah* of that *mantra*. Take, for instance, the *mantra*—

अग्निं दूतं पुरोदधे हव्यवाहमुपश्रुवे देवां २  
आसादयादिह ॥ यजुः । २३ । १७ ॥

“I present to your consideration *agni* which is the fruitful source of worldly enjoyments, which is capable of working as though it were a messenger, and is endowed with the property of preparing all our foods. Hear ye, and do the same.”

Since it is *agni* that forms the subject-matter of this *mantra*, *agni* would be called the *devatah* of this *mantra*. Hence, says Yaska, a *mantra* is of that *devatah*, with the object of expressing whose properties, God, the Omniscient, revealed the *mantra*.

We find an analogous sense of the word *devata* in another part of the Nirukta. Says Yaska—

कर्म संपत्तिर्मन्त्रो वेदे ॥ Nirukta, i. 2.

“Whenever the process of an art is described, the *mantra* that completely describes that process is called the *devatah* (or the index) of that process.”

It is in this sense that *devatah* of a *mantra* is the index the essential key-note of the meaning of the *mantra*. There is in this analysis of the word no reference to any gods or goddesses, no mythology, no element worship, no henotheism. If this plain and simple meaning of *devata* were understood, no more will the *mantras* having *marut*

for their *devata* or *agni* for their *devata* be regarded as hymns addressed to the storm-gods or the god of fire ; but it will be perceived that these *mintras* treat respectively of the properties of *marut* and of the properties of fire. It will then be regarded, as said elsewhere in the Nirukta,

देवा दानाहा दीपनाहा द्योतनाहा द्युस्थानो  
भवतीति वा ॥ Nirukta, vii. 15.

That whatsoever is capable of conferring some advantage upon us, capable of illuminating things, or capable of explaining them to us, lastly, the Light of all lights, these are the fit objects to be called *devatas*. This is not in any way inconsistent with what has gone before. For, the *devata* of a *mantra* being the key-note of the sense of the *mantra* is a word capable of rendering an *explanation* of the *mantra*, and hence is called the *devata* of that *mantra*. Speaking of these *devatas*, Yaska writes something which even goes to show that people of his time had not even the slightest notion of the gods & goddesses of Max Muller and superstitious Hindus—gods and goddesses that are now forced upon us under the Vedic designation, *devata*. Says he,

अस्ति ह्याचारो बहुलम् लोके देवदेवत्यमतिथि  
देवत्यं पितृदेवत्यं ॥ Nirukta, vii. 4.

We often find in common practice of the world at large, that learned men, parents, and *atithis*, (or those guest-missionaries) who have no fixed residence, but



wander about from place to place benefiting the world by their religious instruction), are regarded as *devatas* or called by the name of *devatas*. It is clear from the above quotation, that religious teachers, parents and learned men, these alone or the like were called *devatas* and no others in Yaska's time. Had Yaska known of any such idolatry or *devata* worship which superstitious Hindus are so fond of, and which Professor Max Müller is so intent to find in the Vedas or had any such worship prevailed in his time, even though he himself did not share in this worship, it is impossible that he should not have made any mention of it at all, especially when speaking of the common practice among men in general. There can be no doubt that element worship and nature worship is not only foreign to the Vedas and the ages of Yaska and Panini and Vedic *rishis* and *munis*, but that idolatry and its parent mythology, at least in so far as Aryavarta is concerned, are the products of recent times.

To return to the subject. We have seen that Yaska regards the names of those substances whose properties are treated of in the *mantra* as the *devatas*. What substances, then, are the *devatas*? They are all that can form the subject of human knowledge. All human knowledge is limited by two conditions, *i.e.*, *time & space*. Our knowledge of causation is mainly that of succession of events. And succession is nothing but an *order in time*. Secondly, our knowledge must be a knowledge of something and that something must be somewhere. It must have a *locality* of its existence and occurrence

Thus far, the *circumstances* of our knowledge, *time* and *locality*. Now to the essentials of knowledge. The most exhaustive division of human knowledge is between objective and subjective knowledge. Objective knowledge is the knowledge of all that passes without the human body. It is the knowledge of the phenomena of the external universe. Scientific men have arrived at the conclusion that natural philosophy, *i.e.*, philosophy of the material universe, reveals the presence of two things, matter and force. Matter as matter is not known to us. It is only the play of forces in matter producing effects sensible that is known to us. Hence the knowledge of the external world is resolved into the knowledge of *force* with its modifications. We come next to subjective knowledge. In speaking of subjective knowledge, there is, firstly, the ego, the *human spirit*, the conscious entity ; secondly, the internal phenomena of which it is conscious. The internal phenomena are of two kinds. They are either the voluntary, intelligent, self-conscious activities of the mind, and hence may be designated *deliberate action*, or the passive modifications effected in the functions of the body by the presence of the human spirit. These may therefore be called the *vital activities*.

An *a priori* analysis, therefore, of the knowable leads us to six things *time, locality, force, human spirit, deliberate activities*, and *vital activities*. These things, then, are fit to be called *devatas*. The conclusion to be derived from the above enumeration is, that if the account of *Nirukta* concerning Vedic *devatas*, as we have given, be really true, we should find Vedas inculcating these six things,



*time, locality, force, human spirit, deliberate activities, and vital activities, as devatas and no others. Let us apply the crucial test.*

We find, however, the mention of 33 *devatas* in such *mantras* as these :—

II. यस्य त्रयस्त्रिंशद्देवा अङ्गे गात्रा विभेजिरे ।  
तान् वै त्रयस्त्रिंशद्देवानेके ब्रह्मविदो विदुः—अथर्वः

X. xxii. 42-7

I. त्रयस्त्रिंशतास्तुवत भूतान्यशामन् प्रजापतिः  
परमेष्ठ्यधिपतिरासीत् ॥ Yajur, xiv. 13.

“The Lord of all, the Ruler of the universe, the Sustainer of all, holds all things by 33 *devatas*.”

“The knowers of true theology recognize the 33 *devata* performing their proper organic functions, as existing in and by Him, the One and Only.”

Let us, therefore, see what these 33 *devatas* are, so that we may be able to compare them with our *a priori* deductions and settle the question. We read in the Shatapatha Brahmana.

स होवाच महिमान एवैषामेते त्रयस्त्रिंशत्त्वेव  
देवा इति । कतमेते त्रयस्त्रिंशदित्यष्टौ वसव एका-  
दश रुद्रा द्वादशादित्यास्ताः एकत्रिंशदिन्द्रश्चैव प्रजा-  
पतिश्च त्रयस्त्रिंशाविति ॥ ३ ॥ कतमे वसव इति ।  
अग्निश्च पृथ्वी च वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं चादित्यश्च द्यौश्च

चन्द्रमाश्च नक्षत्राणि चैते वसवः एतेषु हीदुः सर्वं वसु-  
हितमेते हीदुः सर्वं वासयन्ते तद्यदिदुः सर्वं वास-  
यन्ते तस्माद्वसव इति ॥ ४ ॥ कतमे रुद्रा इति । दशमे  
पुरुषे प्राणा आत्मैकादश स्ते यदास्मान्मर्त्याच्छरीरादु-  
त्क्रामन्तप्रथ रोदयन्ति तद्यद्रोदयन्ति तस्माद्रुद्रा इति  
॥ ५ ॥ कतम आदित्या इति । द्वादशमासाः संवत्सरस्यै-  
त आदित्या एते हीदुः सर्वमाददाना यन्ति तद्यदि-  
दुः सर्वमाददाना यन्ति तस्मादादित्या इति ॥ ६ ॥  
कतम इन्द्रः कतमः प्रजापतिरिति । स्तनयिबु-  
रेवेन्द्रो यज्ञः प्रजापतिरिति कतम स्तनयिबु रित्यश-  
निरिति । कतमो यज्ञ इति पशव इति ॥ ७ ॥ कतमेते  
त्रयो देवा इतीम एव त्रयो लोका एषु हीमे सर्वे देवा  
इति । कतमौ द्वौ देवावित्यन्नं चैव प्राणश्चेति ॥ ८ ॥  
कतमो ऽध्वर्यु इति योऽयं पवते तदाहुः यदयमेक  
एव पवतेऽथ कथमध्वर्यु इति यदस्मिन्निदुः सर्वमध्वरा-  
ध्वोत्तेनाध्यध्व इति ॥ ९ ॥ कतम को एदेव इति सन्नद्ध  
यदित्याचक्षते ॥ \* Shatapatha P., xiv. 16.

The meaning of the above is :—

"Says Yajnavalkya, Shakalya, there are 33 *devatas* : 8 *asus*,

\* Vide Swami Dayananda Saraswati's Veda Bhashya Bhu-  
mika p 66.



11 *rudras*, 12 *adityas*, *indra* and *prajapati*; 33 on the whole. The eight *vasus* are 1. heated cosmic bodies, 2. planets, 3. atmospheres, 4. superterrestrial spaces, 5. suns, 6. rays of ethereal space, 7. satellites, 8 stars. These are called *vasus*, for the whole treasure of existences resides in them, for they are the abode of all that lives, moves, or is. The eleven *rudras* are the ten nervauric forces enlivening the human frame, and the eleventh is the human spirit. These are called the *rudras*, because when they desert the body, it becomes dead, and the relations of the dead, in consequence of this desertion, begin to *weep* (from root *rud* to weep). The twelve *adityas* are the twelve solar months marking the course of time. They are called *adityas* as by their cyclic motion they produce changes in all objects, and hence the *lapse of the term of existence for each object*. *Aditya* means that which causes such a lapse. *Indra* is the all-pervading *electricity or force*. *Prajapati* is *yajna* (or an active voluntary association of objects, on the part of man, for the purposes of art, or association with other men for purposes of teaching or learning). It also means the *useful animals*. *Yajna* and useful animals are called *prajapati*, as it is by such actions and by such animals that the world at large derives its materials sustenance. 'What, then, are the three *devatas*?'—Asks Shakalya. Says Yajnavalkya, they are *locality, name and birth*. "What are the two *devatas*?"—asked he. Yajnavalkya replied, 'the positive substances, *prana* and negative substances, *auna*.' *Adhyardha* is the universal electricity' the sustainer of the universe known as *sutratma*. Lastly, he inquired, 'Who is the one *Devata*?' Ann Yajnavalkya replied, "God, the adorable."

These, then, are the thirty three *devas* mentioned in the Vedas. Let us see how far this analysis agrees with our *a priori* deduction. The eight *vasus* enumerated in the Shatapatha Brahmana are clearly the *localities*; the twelve *adityas* comprise *time*; the eleven *rudras* include, firstly, the *ego*, the *human spirit*; and secondly, the ten *nervauric forces* may be approximately taken for the *vital activities* of the mind; *electricity* is the all-pervading *force*; whereas *prajapati*, *yajna*, or *pashus* may be roughly regarded as comprising the objects of intelligent *deliberate activities* of the mind.

When thus understood, the 33 *devatas* will correspond with the six elements of our rough analysis. Since the object, here, is not so much to show exactness of detail as general coincidence, partial differences may be left out of account.

It is clear, then, that the interpretation of *devatas* which Yaska gives is the only interpretation that is consistent with the Vedas and the Brahmanas. That no doubt may be left concerning the pure monotheistic worship of the ancient Aryas, we quote from the Nirukta again :

माहाभागरा हिवताया एक आत्मा वद्धा स्तूयते  
 एकस्यात्मनो ऽ न्ये देवाः प्रत्यंगानि भवन्ति । कर्म-  
 जन्मान आत्मजन्मान आत्मैवैषां रथो भवति । आत्मा  
 ऽष्वा आत्मायुधमात्मेष्व आत्मा सर्व देवस्य देवस्य ॥  
 Nirukta, vii. 4:



“ Leaving off all other *devas* it is only the Supreme Soul that is worshipped on account of Its Omnipotence. Other *devatas* are but the *pratyangas* of this Supernal Souls, i. e., they but *partially* manifest the glory of God. All these *devas* owe their birth and power to Him. In Him they have their play. Through Him, they exercise their beneficial influences, by attracting properties useful and repelling properties injurious. He alone is the All in All of all the *devas*.”

From the above, it will be clear that, in so far as worship is concerned, the ancient Aryas adored the Supreme Soul only, regarding Him as the life, the sustenance and dormitory of the world. And yet pious Christian missionaries and more pious Christian philologists are never tired of propagating the lie before the world that the Vedas inculcate the worship of many gods and goddesses. Writes a Christian missionary in India :

“ *Monotheism* is a belief in the existence of one God only ; *polytheism* is a belief in the plurality of gods. Max Muller says, “ If we must employ technical terms, the religion of the Veda is polytheism not monotheism.” The 27th hymn of the 1st Ashtaka of the Rigveda concludes as follows: “ Veneration to the great gods, veneration to the lesser, veneration to the young, veneration to the old; we worship the gods as well as we are able : may I not omit the praise of the older divinities. ”

The pious Christian thus ends his remarks on the religion of the Vedas. “ Pantheism and polytheism are often combined, but monotheism, in the strict sense of the word, is not found in Hinduism.” Again says the

pious missionary, "Ram Mohan Roy, as already mentioned, despised the hymns of the Vedas, he spoke of the Upanishads as the Vedas, and thought that they taught monotheism. The Chhandogya formula, *ekam evadwityam brahma*" was also adopted by Keshub Chander Sen. But it does not mean that there is no second God, but that there is no second anything—a totally different doctrine." Thus it is obvious that Christians, well saturated with the truth of God, are not only anxious to see monotheism off the Vedas, but even off the Upanishads. Well might they regard their position as safe, beyond assail, on the strength of such translations as these.

"In the beginning there arose the Hiranyagarbha (*the golden germ*)—He was the one born lord of all this. He established the earth and this sky :—Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?—*Max Muller*.

"He who gives breath, He who gives strength, whose command all the bright gods revere ; whose shadow is immortality, shadow is death :—Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?—*Ibid*.

Hiranyagarbha, which means 'God in whom the whole luminous universe resides in a potential state' is translated into the golden germ. The word *jatah* is detached from its proper construction and placed in apposition with *patir*, thus giving the sense of "the one born lord of all this." Perhaps, there is a deeper meaning in this Christian translation. Some day, not in the very remote future, these Christians will discover that the *golden germ* means '*conceived by the Holy Ghost*', whereas 'the one born lord of all' alludes to Jesus Christ. In one of those future



happy days, this *mantra* of the Veda will be quoted as an emblematic of a prophecy, in the dark distant past, of the advent of a Christ whom the ancients knew not. How could they, then adore him, but in the language of mystic interrogation? Hence the translation, "Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?" Even the second *mantra*, Max Muller's translation of which we have subjoined above, has been differently translated by an audacious Christian. What Max Muller translates as "He, who gives breath", is translated by this believer in the word of God, as "He who sacrificed Himself, (*i.e.* *Jesus Christ.*.) The original words in Sanskrita are

“ य आत्मदा ”

Let us pass from these *mantras* and the misinterpretations of Christians to clear proofs of monotheism in the Vedas. We find in Rigveda the very *mantra* which yields the golden germ to European interpreters. It runs thus:

हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्त्ततोऽग्रं  
भूतस्य जातः पतिरेक आसीत् ।  
स दाधार पथिवीं द्यामुतेमां  
कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम ॥

“God existed in the beginning of creation, the only Lord of the unborn universe. He is the Eternal Bliss whom we should praise and adore.”

In Yajur Veda, xvii. 19, we find—

विश्वतश्चक्षुरुत विश्वतो मुखी  
विश्वतो बाहुरुत विश्वतस्यात् ।

संवाहुभ्यां धमति सं पतत्रै-  
 र्यावा भूमी जनयन् देव एकः ॥

"Being all vision, all motion in Himself, He sustains with His power the whole universe, Himself being On<sup>e</sup> alone."

And in the Atharva Veda, XIII. iv. 16—21, we find—

न द्वितीयो न तृतीयश्चतुर्थो नाप्युच्यते.....

स एष एक एकवृद्धदेव एव ।

सर्वे अस्मिन् देवा एकवृत्तो भवन्ति ॥

"There are neither two gods, nor three, nor four.....  
 .....nor ten. He is one and only one and pervades the  
 whole universe. All other things live, move and have their  
 being in Him."



# THE ATMOSPHERE

वायवायाहि दर्शतेमे सोमा अरं कृताः ।

तेषां पाहि शुधोहवम् ॥

ऋ० मं० १ । सू० २ । मं० १ ॥

*Vayavayahi darshateme soma*

*arankritah tesham pahi shrudhi hovam*

*RIGVEDA SUKTA, II.—MANTRA I.*

—O—

**T**HERE is nothing which so beautifully illustrates the bounteous dispensation of Providence in Nature as the atmosphere, which surrounds our earth to a certain height all around. This gaseous envelope, which is elastic and at the same time so rare, is especially characterized by its lightness, which renders it amenable to the influence of disturbances even the slightest.

Imagine a huge mass of iron lying inert, say, in one position, and suppose a heavy stone or dense ball dashed against this grotesque ball of iron, and see what follows. You will see how sluggishly the grotesque mass obeys the impulse, how reluctantly, as it were, the idle mass parts with its inert condition to be alive with the activity of the impinging stone! What a wide contrast does the atmosphere present to this inert mass. Each molecule of the air, on account of its lightness and elasticity, so readily succumbs to all forces from without, so mechanically multiplies the impulse, as it were, by its mobility,

that even the slightest tremor first communicated to it sends it dashing along the free path of molecules in air, until it meets a fresh encounter with another molecule. This molecule, like a waiting postilion, immediately stands up and proceeds on its errand. The next molecule obeys it, and the next, and the next. Only a few moments elapse, (not more than five or six seconds), in the twinkling of an eye, when a vast tract in the expansive ocean of air,—a tract of almost a mile in area, 5 times 1100 feet long,—is furrowed over with ripples of exquisite beauty. Just imagine how sensitively delicate the molecules of air must be. There is not a faint flutter of wings, not a noiseless breath that ever escapes and does not furrow tracts upon tracts of air with exquisite waves.

Tremors are thus communicated with gigantic velocity by this mobile air. The invisible artistic designs into which the molecules of air are thus cast, are only beautiful beyond description. "A genuine transcript of the true state of things are the words of poet Emerson."

"Thou canst not wave thy staff in air,  
Or dip thy paddle in the lake,  
But it carves the brow of beauty there,  
And the ripples in rhymes the oars forsake.,,

It is on the mobile wings of air that the fragrance of flowers, the odour of essences and the effluvia of substances are wafted to immense distances, creating a diffusiveness that blends motion into uniformity and harmony. Is not then a *light, mobile, tremor-communicating, effluvia-carrying medium* a better and a more exact



appellation for this masterly creation of the Architect of Nature than the ugly, unmeaning, inexact and half articulate word *air*. It is exactly this sense italicized in the above lines which the Vedic word *vayu* conveys, the word with which the *mantra* quoted above begins.\*

We have seen what the physical properties of the molecules, which compose the air, are. Let us now consider the phenomena which it gives rise to. The rays of the sun falling upon the earth heat the layers of earth, which in their turn heat the layers of air in contact with them. These layers of air when heated become lighter and ascend. Colder layers of air rush in to fill up the vacuum created by the ascending hot layers of air, are heated in their turn, rise and make room for the advent of other similar layers of air. Thus a rapid circulation of heat goes on, which gives rise to currents. Of exactly similar nature are all the winds that blow. From the same cause originate those north-easterly and south-eastern winds known as trade winds. The portions of earth near the equator always receive a greater quantity of heat from the sun than others do. The layers of air in contact with those portions of earth rise, and colder air from northern and southern quarters rushes in towards the equators and, coupled with the rotatory motion of earth gives rise to north-eastern and south-eastern winds. Firstly then, we find that the air is always circulating and giving rise to currents in perpetual motion. This *vayu* then (*ayahi*) is always moving in the form of currents.

---

\* *Vaya* has been derived by Niruktakara from the root *va*, to move, to carry odoriferous matter, or from *vak* to communicate tremors. Hence its meaning as above indicated.

Next see what effect it has in modifying the phenomena of light. The rays of light, that traverse through solar and interplanetary regions, ultimately strike upon the highly rarefied layers of air high above in the skies. In passing from vacuum into air, these rays of light deviate in their course, and pursue a bent direction on account of refraction. Had the lower layers of air, through which these rays have to pass, been of uniform temperature, once having bent in its course in contact with the first layer of air, the ray of light would have then pursued its course undeviated in air. But meeting with layers of air of different temperature and therefore of different densities, it is, at each step that it advances, a little refracted and again refracted again and again, so that these rays, having passed through all curious paths, all zigzag ways that it is possible to imagine, ultimately meet terrestrial objects including the eyes of man, and there excite vision. How wonderfully it modifies and extends the range of vision will then be apparent. Even the most delusive appearance known as "the mirage" that is often seen by travellers in the hot sandy deserts, is due to the reflection and refraction of light at innumerable surfaces presented by the heated layers of air. It is through air, then, that we are able to see not only in the direction of the source of light, the sun, but in all other possible directions. It thus extends the range of our vision. It is also due to air that such delusive phenomena or appearances as the mirage start into vision. Our atmosphere then, besides giving rise to currents, extends the range of our vision



and is the cause of the phenomena like that of mirage. Hence, it is that we have in the Vedic *mantra*, we have quoted above, the word *darshata*, i e., the cause of extension of vision and of other appearances.

Another and a very important part which the air plays in the economy of nature is the purpose it serves of the maintenance of vegetable world. Always there is a certain quantity of carbonic acid present in the air, which though however slight, is sufficient to maintain the equilibrium between the animal and the vegetable worlds. The trees and plants, the main body of which essentially consists of carbon, derive all their carbon from the air. The leaves of plants possess a kind of substance called chlorophyl, which in the presence of light decompose the carbonic acid gas present in the air. The carbon which results from this decomposition, is assimilated by the plants, and the oxygen is set free. This oxygen freed from carbonic acid, so to say, is what animals inspire. Animal life is maintained by the continuance of animal heat, which is due to the combustion of oxygen with carbon of the animal frame. Thus all animals inhale oxygen and exhale carbonic acid, whereas all plants absorb carbon of the carbonic acid. Air thus stands a common vehicle between the vegetable and the animal kingdom. Due to these causes, all plant and animal life depends upon the presence of air. Not only is air necessary for the existence of plants and animals, but also necessary for the maintenance of dynamical equilibrium between these two classes of organic nature. The word *soma* used in the Vedas, means something that springs out of

earth, and especially designates the vegetable kingdom which, as such, is necessarily dependent upon the soil from which it springs. Hence we have *soma arankritah tesham pahi* in the Vedic *mantra*, meaning thereby that the atmosphere furnishes the plants with air and food, and preserves the equilibrium between the vegetable and the animal kingdom.

Another fact worth noticing in discussing the phenomena of air, is that it is the vehicle of all sounds. Man has been often called a speaking animal; and, no doubt, the capacity of speech distinguishes man to a very great extent from other members of the animal kingdom. Now this speech, which, in this sense, is at the root of our advancement & civilization essentially consists of articulated sounds, the utility of which would have been entirely marred, if there had been no air. Air, then, is also a vehicle of sound, a fact which is mentioned in the *mantra* in the last two words, *shrudhi havam*,—it makes our sounds, and all others as well, heard.



मित्रं हुवे पूत दक्षं वरुणं च रिशादसम् ।

धियं धृताचीं साधन्ता ॥ ऋ० अ० १ सू० मं० ७ ॥

*Mitram huve puta daksham varunam  
cha rishadasam, dhiyam ghr itacham sadhanta.*  
*RIGVEDA, 2nd SUKTA, 7th MANTSA.*

—o—

THE word *rig* signifies the expression of the nature, properties and actions and re-actions produced by substances. Hence the name has been applied to the Rig Veda as its function is to describe the physical chemical and active properties of all material substance as well as the psychological properties of all mental substances. Next to a knowledge of things comes the practical application of that knowledge, for all knowledge has some end, that end being usefulness to man. Hence Yajur Veda comes next to Rig Veda, the meaning of Yajur being application. It is upon this double principle of liberal and professional ( or technical ) education that the well-known division of the course of study of Aryans, the Vedas, into Rig and Yajur, is based.

Let us not mock at the position taken by the Aryas with respect to the nature of the Vedas, for there are reasons enough to justify this position. Not being a novel position at all, it is the position that is maintained even according to the Hindu systems of mythology which are but gross, corrupt distortions of Vedic sense and meaning. The broad and universal distinction of all training into professional and liberal has been alto-

gether lost sight of in the Puranic mythology and like everything else has been contracted into a narrow superstitious sphere of shallow thought. The Vedas instead of being regarded as universal text books of liberal and professional sciences, are now regarded as simply codes of religious thought. Religion, instead of being grasped as the guiding principle of all active propensities of human nature, is regarded as an equivalent of certain creeds and dogmas. So with the Rig and Yajur Vedas. Yet, even in this distorted remnant of Aryan thought and wisdom, the Puranic mythology, the division of the Vedas into Rig and Yajur, the liberal and the professional, is faithfully preserved. The *rig*, now, implies a collection of hymns and songs in praise and *description* of various gods and goddesses; whereas Yajuh, now, stands for the mantras recited in the ritual, the active part of religious ceremonies. This is the view taken by the so-called scholars of the day.

Let us not, however, altogether forget the original distinction. There is much in it to recommend itself. The mantra at the top, which has been taken from the second Sukta of Rig Veda, is cited here as a sample to justify the views entertained by the Aryas with respect to the Rig Veda. This mantra describes the (*dhiyam*) process or steps whereby the well-known of liquids, water, can be formed by the combination of *two* other substances (*gritashim sadhanta*). The word *sadhanta* is in the dual number indicating that it is two elementary bodies which combine to form water. What those two elementary substances according to this mantra



are, is not a matter of least importance to determine. The words used to indicate those two substances are *mitra* and *varuna*.

The first literal meaning of *mitra*\* is measurer. The name is given to a substance that stands, as it were, as a measurer or as standard. substances It is the measurer of density, or of value, otherwise known as quantivalence. The other meaning of *mitra* is "associate". Now in this mantra, *mitra* is described as an associate of *varuna*.† It will be shown how *varuna* indicates oxygen gas.† Now it is well-known that hydrogen is not only the lightest element known, nor is it only monovalent, but that it has a strong affinity for oxygen; hence it is that it is described as an associate of *varuna*. Many other analogies in the properties of *mitra* and *hydrogen* go on to suggest that what is in Vedic terms styled as

---

\*The word *mitra* is formed by adding the unadi suffix *kra* to the root *mi*, according to the sutra, *Amichi misha si blyah kra* Unadi Kosh. iv, 161.—The meaning is *minoti manyam karoti mitrah* or one that measures or stands as a standard of reference.

† *Varuna* is formed by adding unadi suffix *unan* to root *eri* to accept *Kri bri daribhya unan*—53. Hence it names that which is acceptable to all or seeks all.

† Again, we have in Nighan u, the Vedic Dictionary, Chapter V. Section 4. *Mitra iti . danamasee pathitan*. Hence *mitra* means that which approaches or seeks associations with others.

*mitra* is in fact identical with hydrogen. *Mitra* for instance, occurs as synonymous with *udana* in many parts of the Vedas, and *udana* is well characterised by its lightness or by its power to lift up.

The second element with which we are concerned is *varuna*. *Varuna* is the substance that is acceptable to all. It is the element that every living being needs to live. Its well-known property is *rishadah*, i.e., it eats away or rusts all the base metals, it burns all the bones, &c., and physiologically purifies the blood by oxidizing it, and thereby keeping the frame alive. It is by these properties that *varuna* is in general distinguished; but it is especially characterized here as *rishadah*. No one can fail to perceive that the substance thus distinctly characterized is oxygen gas.

Another word used in the mantra is *puta daksham*. *Putra* is pure, free from impurities. *Daksha* means energy. *Putra daksham* is a substance pure possessed of kinetic energy. Who that is acquainted with the kinetic theory of gases cannot see in *puta daksha* the properties of a gas highly heated?

The meaning of the mantra taken as a whole is this: Let one who is desirous to form water by the combination of two substances, take pure hydrogen gas highly heated and oxygen gas possessed of the properties *rishadah*, and let him combine them to form water.

It would, no doubt, sound strange that long before Cavendish performed his experiment on the composition of water, or long before oxygen or phlogiston were



known to the philosophers of the west, the true philosophy of the composition of water was recorded in the Vedas and perhaps understood by many philosophers of the east.

Let not any of our readers imagine that the interpretation of the Vedic mantra given above is purely an imaginary production of the brain of the writer. The above interpretation is in fact based upon some already existing commentaries of the Vedas, and there is enough either in ancient commentaries or in that of Swami Dayananda to suggest this and similar interpretations of all mantras.

ॐ

उदुत्यं जातवेदसं देवं वहन्ति केतवः ।

दृष्टे विष्णुय मूर्त्ये ॥

—o—

**B**EFORE I begin an exposition of a few mantas of the 30th Sukta of Rig Veda bearing on the subject of *Grihastha*, let it be remarked in due justice to ancient *rishis* who lived in days when Vedas were better understood and more sincerely, honestly and truthfully revered than the Bible, the Zendavastha and the Qoran are now-a-days—yes, let it be remarked in justice to those *rishis* that to their minds many of the obvious and more recon-dite forces of nature were the ladders by which they rose from the lower depths of material objects to the celestial heights of divine contemplation. Their thought familiarly climbed upon the ladder of physical forces till a glimpse of the divine was obtained. Invigorated with the light thus received, it as easily retraced its footsteps to share the bounty with their fellow-brethren, the whole race of mankind. Let me observe that, whilst I speak in this strain, I am giving expression to no vague, indefinite ideas of my own, to no whisperings of erratic imagination. These are no words of flattery offered as sacrifice at the altar of national conceit, prejudice, or custom. They are rather honest but imperfect expressions of the lives which *rishis* no doubt lived. But more sublime and astonishingly charming was the state of those four *rishis*, Agni, Vayu, Aditya and Angirah—living in the beginning of creation, whose faculties were, according to the beliefs of the



Aryans, illumed by the light of the Vedas. The dizzy heights to which the thoughts of these *rishis* soared, but with no giddiness; the meandering labyrinths through which their intellects traced the unity of the divine design, quite unperplexed, and not fatigued, but rather cheered and invigorated by the effort; these are facts which we—innocent darlings of the nineteenth century, the era of civilisation—we darlings fed in the lap of material science, nourished by the milk of ponderous truths, discovered by elaborate ratiocinative and inductive Processes, and supported by the carbonaceous aliment of isolated facts and nitrogenous edibles of constructive theories and hypotheses, cannot easily conceive. The truth-loving, poetical, beauty-admiring temperament of these *rishis* is far, far removed from the money-loving, practical, use-admiring callous minds of moderns. No wonder, then, that we should find so very few expositors of Vedic lore in this era of research and activity. Truth with sectarian ignoramus and religious-prejudice-spectacles wearers may be measured by the number of its adherents or votaries, and well might Mahomedans and Christians argue that their overwhelming number in the world is a proof that Christianity is the dispensation, destined by the divinity to prevail over the world. But far different is the case with Vedic truth. It is perennial. It is not the birth of to-day or yester-day just as other religions are. The measure of Vedic truth is not its power to grow and spread, but its inherent power to remain the same, ever to-day and to-morrow. "Men and parties, sects and schools are but the mere ephemera of world's day. Truth, high-seated upon its rock of adamant, is alone eternal and supreme."

It was this truth of God and Nature that was given to the primitive four *rishis* to comprehend. Justly, may our uninspired eyes roam about in vain from here to there, from rocks to vegetables and from vegetables to men to detect unity; but the inspired minds of the four *rishis* could only perceive the unity of the Divine mind in every thing. The minerals, the vegetables and the animals were to them but one book, in which they read but the power, the justice and the wisdom of God. Owing to the sublimity of revelation, were foreshadowed before their mind's eye landscape-paintings of human institutions, achievements and aspirations in a long distant future, and in all these, they saw the spirit of the Father brooding with paternal care over eternal designs for the happiness and benefit of his children. Reader, imagine yourself once in this exalted condition. Then alone are you in a fit position to grasp and understand the deep meaning of the Vedic mantras. This deep meaning is every where spiritual. There is a fine and very sublime link between mantra and mantra, which can be perceived but in such moments of exaltation alone.

We must bear in mind that the internal is always the more difficult to grasp. The modern scholar, whose powers of the senses have been well trained to observe and carefully note the phases and changes undergone by physical phenomena, may not find any connection or coherency between mantra and mantra. To him the Vedas may be mere collections of isolated prayers to deified forces of nature including wind and rain; but to an earnest, truthful inquirer, who has entered the exalted



condition. I have above described, there is that logical coherence and philosophical regularity in the sequence of the *mantras* which can only be called *divine*. In this spirit should we study the Vedas, a sample of which is presented by the 50th Sukta.

I have before said that the universe, as construed by the *rishis*, is a ladder along which the inspired mind rises to the contemplation of the Divine. This exactly is the subject matter of this mantra of the 50th Sukta of Rig Vedas.

In a dark, rainy stormy night, in an hour of stillness and dead slumber, a thief entered the treasure room of a peaceful family, and stole away all precious metal and property, and in the mad joy of his possession ran amuck over twenty miles of wet ground, and betook himself as quite safe from the grasp of the owner. But the light dawned, and the owner awoke in full consciousness of his stolen property. Fearlessly and resolutely but in entire calm of his mind, he began the track and slowly but surely reached the rendezvous which the thief had appropriated. This is but mere analogy. I have nothing to do with the stealth and the property, but with the indelible, unmistakable footprints, not of a thief, but of the Creator on the frame of the universe. The wise man who has his intellect illumined by universal benevolence, **सजीवः धीराः** bent upon finding out the *first cause* begins his inquiry, and, slowly but steadily tracing nature back to its source, halts at God. There, the inquisitive and penetrative faculties of the intellect are cooled to satiation, and lie in peaceful repose in the enjoyment of the treasure thus found. To such a mind, what are the

different objects of this universe ? They are the footprints of the Deity, the postmarks tracked by the divine rays of wisdom along their path of action. They are just as the Vedic mantra puts it, **केतवः** the flag signs, track-beams, the design types which point with one voice to Him **त्य** from whom all has proceeded **जातवेदमं** He is the eternal Sun that ever shines **देवम्** He it is who makes us see this grand panorama of the universe **दृष्टेविश्वाय सूर्यम्** So also is the case with the sun of the material universe. Would you see the variegated objects of nature ? Study, then, the sunbeams playing amidst wonders of space, and see what they lead you to. They lead us to the globe of the sun, who is truly the cause of all we see; for not only has all the matter of the planetary system proceeded from the sun, but the very light which reveals to us the existence of the material objects in their diverse forms and colours, points out to the sun as its source and fountain-head. Would you, then, see the universe ? Then observe that the universe points you out to the wonder of the planetary system, the sun. Would you enjoy your term of earthly life in peace of mind and happiness perpetual ? Observe, then, that the entire happiness of the world points out to the sacred institution of marriage, of *grihastha*, the institution where alone the filial, the paternal, the fraternal and conjugal affections are cooled to satiation; for, from pure, truthful, affectionate and wisely conducted marriages can happy progeny flow into the world. This is the three-fold sense of the Vedic mantra. It points out to God as the fountain of all



cauastion, to the sun as source of all the planetary world and its chromatic wonders, and to the sacred institution of marriage, founded upon pure, rational and spiritual physiology, as the source of all happiness and bliss on this earth.

अपत्ये तायवो तथा यच्चत्रा यंत्यक्तुभिः ।

सूराय विष्णुचक्षसे ॥

**I** come now to the second mantra of the same Sukta

I have mentioned that happiness on this earth can only be secured by rightly conducting the sacred and divine institution of marriage. I need not speak here at length on this subject, but it will be well to point out that all attempts to regenerate our society in any other direction are merely fruitless. Do you ever expect a heroic, Swami-like, intellectual progeny from the present marriages contracted in an unnatural age, by parties forced by unnatural compulsion of parents into these contracts? To expect this, is to expect an impossibility. Teaching and preaching, education and consociation, can mould the superficial or the external character of man, but strike ineffectually at the deeper and more permanent character, the hereditary or the constitutional character, which flows with our blood, which we have drunk in with the very milk from our mothers, which we have inherited with our very bones and nerves, blood and muscles. Believe it, then, that true cure of the evil that exists in our society is the physiological cure, the cure that strikes at the very root of the disease of our society, the cure that professes to mould the individual and society from their

very birth, by enjoining the observance of the Divine injunction of pure, truthful, rational marriage, as contrasted with compulsatory, impulsive, formal marriage. What, then, is the law of marriage, what is the observance that can secure health and happiness to society? The answer to this question is imprinted in the indestructible divine laws of nature. Observe the starry host of heaven,

**नक्षत्राः** or the moisture-laden ocean of the atmosphere **तायवो** What law do they obey? Are they not regular

in the succession of the phenomena they present?, Regularly after every 24 hours does the starry host of heaven unite itself with night **यं त्यक्तुभिः** regularly for 12 hours in 24 does it depart from the society of the sun,

**सूराय विश्वचक्षसे** Here are suggestions for the married people. Let them reflect over this and chalk out a path of piety for themselves. Again study the atmospheric envelope. What law does it obey? Regularly after every year does the monsoon blow, regularly for six months do the winds continue to take the same direction. These proclaim a lesson for the married. The lesson is for the married parties to separate themselves invariably during sunlight, as the starry heaven disconnects itself from the sunlight, for every 12 hours. The second lesson for them is to observe the law of periodicity just as day and night, trade winds and monsoons obey their periodic laws of succession. If these laws were carefully observed there would flow into the world that happiness and health which were never realized before. Earth would be a beautiful garden to live in, far more attractive and



real than the paradise of the Moslems or the heaven of the Christians, which is all paved with hard gold, with no stuffed cushions to relieve us of its hardness. Compare with this natural, spiritual, physiological marriage the beastly marriages, a countless number of which are being contracted from day to day in our country without exciting the ridicule or even the thought of the reformers. I count upon no responsibility so serious as that of ushering an individual being organised like our own selves into the world. How many are they who feel this responsibility? How few children are there who are born of a wilful, appreciative, conscientious consociations of their parents? How many of them are the products of lust, blind impulse, and purely fortuitous concourse? These are the things that may well sound obscene to many of our delicately constituted readers, but human nature is sacred in every part. It calls for obedience to its dictates in each direction. It is no respecter of creeds or personalities. Let us learn, then, the law of periodicity, and realize the happiness that is in store for us by virtue of the divine ordination mentioned in these mantras.

**I** Do not wish to leave the subject of marriages without impressing upon the minds of my reader another truth which, is not the less important, a truth which forms the subject-matter of the 3rd mantra of this Sukta. What language, but the sweet accents of the Vedas, adequately express this truth? These are the words of the mantras:—

अदृश्यमस्य केतवो विरश्मयो जनां अनु ।

भ्राजंतो अग्नयो यथा ॥

I do not wish to discourse upon an irrelevant topic, but all nature is unique. Truth is all of one type. The digression may be excused. Scientific people believe, and no doubt, upon grounds indubitable that light and heat are eternal associates of each other. Each possesses in its bosom, the essence, the elements, and the power of developing the other. Both are forms of motion, they are vibrations only differing in the frequency of their occurrence. The vibrations occur in the same medium. Light is capable of being reflected. So is heat. Light is capable of being polarized. So is heat. Heat maintains the life of the animal frame. Light maintains the life of the vegetable kingdom. Heat produces the vapoury atmosphere. Light precipitates the cloudy mass in rain and pours it upon the plains. Light and heat are conjugal associates in nature. Heat is warm, light is cold and refreshing. Heat and light are the love and life of the body. They are each other's companions and complements in Nature. The gorgeous display of colours, which light makes us familiar with, are not less striking than the equally important molecular and chemical changes which heat works out. By heating a body you can raise it to incandescence, till it begins to burn; by proper means, you can enliven light and make it heat our articles and even burn them, if necessary. But see how they proceed from the sun, their common fountain. They



proceed in pair. The warm, exciting, heating rays of the sun are the **भ्राजन्तो अग्नयः** of the Vedic mantras; the light-emitting, colour-providing variegating rays of the sun are the **रश्मयो केतवः** of the mantra. How beautifully are they interlocked with each other. Held in each other's embrace, these caloric and spectral rays dart from the sun, and journey on together through millions of miles of gorgeous space to fall on earth, to warm life and illuminate dormant intellect. The arrogant man of science may claim to himself the power of sifting these interlocked, interwadded, embosomed conjugal pairs of rays by iodine filters and alum solutions; but there is no absolute separation, no entire dissevering of bonds. Let us learn a lesson from this. The Vedic mantra enjoins upon us this lesson. It enjoins upon men the duty of learning the lesson of conjugal relation from the heat and light rays of the sun **जनां अनु**. It inculcates the inviolability of the marriage tie. Let the married couple preserve their sacred relation inviolable and intact, and not frustrate their peace and happiness by adopting the opposite course of free-marriages. The designs of the Divinity can only be wrought by the inviolability of this tie. One inviolable marriage conducted according to the periodic law alone is compatible with an acquisition of the true knowledge of the Divine Being. This is the sacred law of inviolability that the Vedic mantra enjoins. But there is another and a deeper meaning of the mantra which should not be lost sight of. It is that light and heat permeate through every possible material object of

creation **हमां अनुपष्टिः ॥ जन** is the class of created objects. Let us not laugh at this proposition. It has the solid bulwark of science to support it. Heat is a motion of the molecules composing the body. There is no substance, of whatever description, that is entirely destitute or completely devoid of molecular vibration. Vibration is the general law. Light is an accident of ether, the luminiferous medium, whose vibration essentially constitutes light. Is there any substance throughout the range of created objects, wherein motion and ether do not conjugally and co-ally dwell? Yes, even in the same way the Divine essence lives within the very interior of every living soul.



*"In the whole world there is no study, except that of the originals, so beneficial and so elevating as that of the OUPANEKHAT. It has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death!"—SCHOPENHAUER.*

ॐ । ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किञ्च जगत्यां जगत् ।  
तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जथा मा गृधः कस्यस्त्रिदधनम् ॥ १ ॥

1.—"By one Supreme Ruler is this universe pervaded; even every world in the whole circle of Nature. Enjoy pure delight, O man, by abandoning all thought of this perishable world; and covet not the wealth of any creature existing."

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतु समाः ।  
एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ २ ॥

2.—Aspire, then, O man to live by virtuous deeds for a hundred years in peace with thy neighbours. Thus alone, & not otherwise, will thy deeds not influence thee.

असुर्या नाम ते लोका अन्धेन तमसावृताः ।  
तांस्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति ये के चात्महनो जनाः ॥ ३ ॥

3.—"To those regions where Evil Spirits dwell, and which utter darkness involves, surely go after death all such men as destroy the purity of their own souls."

अनेजदेकमनसो जवोयो नैनहे वा आप्नुवन् पूर्वमर्षत्  
तद्वावतोऽन्यानत्येति तिष्ठत्तस्मिन्नपो मातरिष्वा दधाति

4.—There is one unchangeable, eternal, intelligent Spirit, even more vigorous than mind. Material senses

cannot perceive Him. Therefore the sage withdraws his senses from their natural course and perceives the Supreme Being everywhere present.

तदेजति तन्नैजति तदूरे तद्वदन्तके ।

तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य तदु सर्वस्यास्य बाह्यतः ॥ ५ ॥

5.—He moves all, but Himself does not move. To the ignorant He is far, but to the wise He is at hand. He pervades inside and outside of all.

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मान्येवानुपश्यति ।

सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥ ६ ॥

6.—He who considers all beings as existing in the Supreme Spirit, & the Supreme Spirit as pervading all beings, can not view with contempt any creature whatever !

यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः ।

तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥ ७ ॥

7.—How can joy and sorrow overtake him who, through wisdom, perceives the Unitary Spirit as dwelling in all beings ?

सपर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रणमसूाविरशुद्धमपापविद्धम्

कविर्मनीषो परिभूः स्वयंभूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान्

व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः ॥ ८ ॥

8.—“ He overspreads all creatures. He is entirely Spirit, without the form either of a minute body, or an extended one, which is liable to impression or organiza-



tion. He is the Ruler of the intellect, self-existent, pure perfect, omniscient, and omnipresent. He has from all eternity been assigning to all creatures their respective purposes."

**अंधन्तमः प्रविशन्ति येऽविद्यामुपासते ।**

**ततो भूय इव ते तमो य उ विद्यायां रताः ॥ ९ ॥**

9.—Miserable are they who worship ignorance; but far more miserable are they who arrogantly presume knowledge.

**अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्ययान्यदेवाहुर्विद्यया ।**

**इति शुश्रम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचचक्षिरे ॥ १० ॥**

10.—Saints wise and firm assure us that ignorance, the life of senses, produces one result; and knowledge, the life of spirit, produces exactly the reverse.

**विद्याञ्चाविद्याञ्च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।**

**अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययामृतमश्नुते ॥ ११ ॥**

11.—He who realizes both, passes through physical dissolution by virtue of the life of senses, and enters into immortality by virtue of the life of spirit.

**अंधन्तमः प्रविशन्ति येऽसंभूतिमुपासते ।**

**ततो भूय इव ते तमो य उ संभूत्यां रतः ॥ १२ ॥**

12.—Miserable are they who worship atoms as the efficient cause of the world ; but far more miserable are they who worship the visible things born of atoms.

अन्यदेवाहुः सम्भवादन्यदाहुरसम्भवात् ।

इति शुश्रम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचचक्षिरे ॥ १३ ॥

13.—Saints wise and firm assure us that the worship of atoms leads to one result and that of things visible to the reverse.

संभूतिं च विनाशं च यस्तद्वेदोभयं स ह ।

विनाशेन मृत्युं तीर्त्वा संमृत्यामृतमश्नुते ॥ १४ ॥

14.—He who realizes both, after death which is the consequence of the worship of things visible, enjoys immortality, the fruit of the realization of divine power displayed in atoms.

हिरण्ययेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखं ।

तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥ १५ ॥

15.—“O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, unveil that face of the *true* sun which is now hidden by a veil of golden light; so that we may see the *truth* and know our whole duty.”

पूषन्ने कर्षे यम सूर्य प्राजापत्य व्यूह रश्मीन् समूह ।

तेजो यत्ते रूपङ्गल्याणमन्तसे पश्यामि

योऽसावसौ पुरुषः सोऽहमस्मि ॥ १६ ॥

16. O Preserver, Sage of sages, Ruler, Eternal Light, Life of the creation! Gather up Thy rays, so that I may be able to feel Thy glorious presence full of beatitude. This alone is my earnest prayer.



वायुरनिलममृतमथेदं भस्मान्तं शरीरम् ।

ॐ कृतो स्मर कृतं स्मर कृतो स्मर कृतं स्मर १७

17. The air shall sustain the immortal spiritual body, the gross one shall only last till cremation. O thou! who hast sown the seed of deeds, remember that the same thou shalt reap.

अग्ने नय सुपथा राये अस्मान्

विश्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान् ।

युयोध्यस्मज्जुहुराणमेनो

भूयिष्ठान्ते नम उक्तिं विधेम ॥ १८ ॥

18. O All-wise Being! Thou art the source of knowledge, inspire us with Thy wisdom, lead us to rectitude and drive off our evil. To this end, we repeatedly praise Thee and adore.

## EXPOSITION.

—:O:—

**R**ELIGION, as society at present exists, has been grossly *misconceived*. Artificial prayers, consisting of set phrases, uttered almost unconsciously, or, at the best, in a state of semi-consciousness, by unfeeling hearts, who, in their lives and conduct, have betrayed inhuman vices, cruelty, uncontrollable passions, strong antipathies & inexcusable weaknesses; forced ceremonials, adopted through imitation, habit, fashion, custom, or fear of society; costly, useless, energy-wasting and time-consuming rituals; bold iniquities, that priests and leaders of sects have practiced, establishing inequalities of men in the sight of Heaven; these and similar other *absurdities* have usurped the title of *religion*, and have inundated the world with an uncontrolled flood of misery, vice, crime, war and bloodshed. The countenance of religion has become completely disfigured by looks of mutual hatred and diabolical enmity, by freaks of vengeance and ambition, by anxiety-toned glare of selfish eyes, by anger broken brow of intolerance, and by the dreadful pallour of falsehood-poisoned faculties.

Reason and faithfulness have been divorced from the entire domain of intellect. Religion has become synonymous with a mere profession of creeds or opinions. Mere faith has been substituted for living good lives and doing gracious deeds. *Words* have dethroned *works*. Superstition and mythology have dictated explanations of the mystery of the universe—explanations that are not less interesting, not more true than the tales of Arabian Nights. Metaphysics has been driven to bear witness



to the competency of the story-telling, lie-manufacturing machinery of these explanations. Guess and conjecture fill the room of exactness and certainty. Dreams have been entrusted upon society as facts. Imagination has been strained to yield forth supernatural theology, preternatural miracles and unnatural doctrines. Human nature has been vilified, insulted and stigmatized, as wholly depraved. Hope and expectation have been banished from the future. Eternal hell flames and mighty engines of torture have been forged and imposed upon the people instead.

Many useful and noble faculties have been denied their privilege, others have been completely suppressed; whereas some have been put to severe persecution and trying ordeal. The whole stock of energy has been consigned to begotry and dogmatism. Such, in fact, has been the office of religion.

Many gifted intellects, endowed with clear heads, have perceived this ruinous character of religion, and have revolted at it. And such is the sad spectacle still presented that many minds do yet revolt at it, and feel an aversion towards religion which is highly prejudicial to the interests of progress and truth. The noble conceptions which *true religion* might have engendered, the joys that might have sprung therefrom, fertilizing and gardenizing the soil of life, are entire strangers to the necessarily sceptical, honest, truth-seeking minds of present times.

Is not all this deplorable? Is nothing better possible? Are we to be set adrift on the ocean of *uncertain*, yet

*honest* scepticism? Is the mystery of life really insoluble? Perhaps, it is not given to man to understand the nature of things! If it be so, life would be a sad spectacle indeed; pains and miseries of this world would be simply unbearable.

Fortunately, however, the above is attributable to human ignorance of true religion. True religion is free from all artificiality and fabrication. True religion is not merely oral profession. It is no mythology. It is a living essence. It is *highly practical*. It is *founded on entire truth*. It takes for its basis the *harmonious developement of all the faculties*, the righteous unfolding of all our capabilities of knowing and being.

Religion, true religion, consists in living a life in Divinity; for

"There's a Divinity that shapes our ends,  
"Rough-hew them how we will."

To realize the existence of this Divinity, and to feel its presence everywhere and at every time with us, is the first lesson to be learnt in religion. The *conception* that Nature with her immutable laws and inexhaustible energies, with her infinity of forms and phenomena—is not an edifice of "chance" but has the positive fact of an Ever-active and Moving Principle diffused throughout Nature for its basis, is the beginning of religion. When one has realized *this*, and, in the joyous depths of his consciousness, can exclaim, "BY ONE SUPREME RULER IS THIS UNIVERSE PERVADED, EVEN EVERY WORLD IN THE WHOLE CIRCLE OF NATURE," he is then fit to take a step further, and



learn the lesson of individual reformation. But the lesson of individual reformation is never received till man has learnt to penetrate through the fleeting forms and phenomena of Nature to Nature's God.

Nature widely spreads her *evanescent* charms and *fleeting* beauties everywhere. Man is easily misled by her alluring attractions and wild enchantments to forget the *Everlasting, Eternal* God that resides in the interior of and pervades each of her *ephemeral* productions. The human mind, when as yet undeveloped and unrefined, is soon held in captivity by the bondage of sensuous phenomena of world. The gorgeous display of riches and wealth, the pompous show of rank and dignity, the luxuriant abundance of opulence, the licentious sensualisms of ease and affluence, not unoften unbalance the young unsophisticated mind, and merge him into a sea of *worldly* ambitions, and expose him to the *earthly* anxieties of Envy, Passion, Jealousy, Hatred and Vice. Not seldom is man thus blinded to the interests of his everlasting life; and the true delight that ever enters the bosom of a devotee, who, while holding himself aloof from the affections of this phenomenal world, contemplates the All-pervading God of the Universe in his bounteous dispensation throughout Nature, is thus a stranger to him. Man consequently, requires to be reminded that this world is a fleeting show, that the pleasures of sense are never permanent, that an earthly life is an unweedy garden that never grows to seed, and that empty titles, names and honors, reaped in this world, will not last. It is wrong to hold out our affections for things perishable. The Eternal,

the Everlasting, should engage our attention, draw our affections, absorb our interest, excite our aspirations, for, then alone, is true delight possible.

Wouldst thou, O man, flee from the evils of this world, from the glamour of earthly pomp and deception? Wouldst thou get rid of envy, passion, jealousy and hatred? Wouldst thou be released from the restraints, burdens cares and anxieties of earthly bondage? Dost thou seek for the *pure everlasting* enjoyment of peace and happiness? Then, " ENJOY PURE DELIGHT, O MAN, BY ABANDONING ALL THOUGHTS OF THIS PERISHABLE WORLD, "

When this conceived, what a blessing is religion, pure religion! Its lessons are full of wise and useful teachings. Led from Nature to Nature's God, we learn to contemplate the perishableness of this world and dislodge our affections for it. When thus fitted, we are able to take a step further; and that leads directly to individual reformation, which essentially depends upon the perception of *justice*, a principle deepest engrained in human nature.

There is a Deific Essence that rules and governs all by a *general wise providence* intended for *the highest good of all*. This universal providence enlivens the minutest atom as well as the largest sun, and fits the one and the other each for its respective mission which is the highest good of all. A realisation of this providence working for the highest good of *all*, and a sympathetic vibration with the pulsations of this providence constitutes a true perception of the principle.



The highest good of all being the object, the wondrous system of Nature is the Divine Institution fulfilling this mission in a truly wondrous and sublime manner. Its eternal, immutable unchangeable laws are the Divine code of perfect legislation, breathings from the essence of the Deity, modes in which He externally lives, rule and governs all. He keeps no vigilant, watchful, designing, conspiring, and often-times dishonest, corruptible police to keep a record of each one's doings, and to superintend his actions, lest they disturb the general peace of His subjects. The Divine Institution is not susceptible of such weaknesses. Each one's memory is his infallible record-keeper, whereas the sensible organisation that apprises each of pleasure and pain, is the Omnipresent police whose mission is not to punish but to teach lessons and to reform. There are no courts where law-suits are decided; but social feelings, affections and other emotions are the interior chambers of the mind where Reason sits on the throne of perpetual judgment. This is the *universal* machinery employed in the Institution of Nature. And its object being the highest good of all, it is so regulated that the personal good of each, on the whole, consists in the good of all. The eternal and immutable laws of Nature, consequently, recognize no special obligations, no individual isolated rights, and are no respecters of persons. One way the whole current of Nature flows—THE COMMON WEAL. No violation of this common course is possible without involving the transgressor in the consequences of his transgression—consequences, by virtue of which he is thrown off from the

common course, for a moment, to leave the general current undisturbed, to get himself purified, rectified, and resigned, if not willing to be subservient to the interests of the universal whole.

The law of justice that keeps each being in peaceful relations with his neighbour, and dictates to him the standard of purity of his own soul, also enjoins upon him the *self-chosen* and *pleasing* duty of living in peace with his neighbours, and in tune with the external world. The destruction of his equilibrium is what constitutes discord, disease, misery, war and destruction. Should any individual, therefore, attempt to disturb the general peace, the indispensable consequences of this *transgression* will inevitably devolve themselves upon him. But far different is the case of *one* who consciously and wilfully adopts the career that providence has designed and regulated for all. His path, though difficult in the beginning, leads straight to individual happiness and social welfare. His is a path of peace and tranquillity. No envious heart-burn, no exhausting emulation, no feeling of contempt or disgust, no despair or disappointment, no discontentment with his environments ever prompts him to swerve from the righteous course and spoil the temple of his personal health and individual existence. On the contrary, his social and fraternal feelings are saturated to satiation, his disinterested nature uplifts him above ordinary persecution or selfishness, his reason is unclouded, and his will pure and undefiled. For let man once comprehend that there is a wise Providence that regulates the affairs of the boundless universes



around us by the ordination of general laws, let him once to his satisfaction understand, comprehend and know these general laws, and feel the existence of this providence in the depths of his heart fully enough never to forget it for a single moment in his life, let him once enter this condition, and he will feel the unity of his spirit with that of others. He will find himself in turn with all others. Then will arise perception of true brotherhood with mankind, for it will be seen that our delight consists in making others happy.

It is this perception of universal justice (which regards all mankind as one brotherhood and impels man to seek the harmonization of his interest with duty, lest in not doing so, he may transgress the motion of natural currents that lead to general good), that can keep one willingly and delightfully from infringing upon the rights and liberties of others. Thus alone, when in accord with the maxims of universal justice, can he truthfully exclaim: "COVET NOT THE WEALTH OF ANY CREATURE EXISTING." Only then, and not till then, is true individual reformation possible.

Religious progress, however, does by no means end here. Merely to keep one's self aloof from the turmoils of this earthly life, to remain, as it were, unimpressed by the fleeting show and vanity of this world, or lastly to abstain from infringing upon the rights and liberties of others, is but the negative or prohibitive side of religion with which even sinful indolence, coldest indifference, confiding residence, and an abetter's silence are compatible. Religion is too positive to be restricted to these

mere prohibitive duties. The wondrous organization of man endowed with *potent* energies, & *vivacious* capabilities has some *more imperative* demands, points out to the existence of some higher ends, and cannot be silenced by the dictates of mere prohibitive morality. For purposes of mere peaceful enjoyment, never in conflict with the enjoyments of others, a passive organization would have been quite enough. But man possesses active powers, innate energies, and stirring elements; and all these are not in vain. They beckon him towards the *constant application and energetic employment* of all his bodily and mental powers for the glorious end of achieving peace and happiness for himself and his neighbours. Activity and not sluggishness is the law of nature. Animate and inanimate Nature, both are full of lively energy and restless animation. Nothing is idle. The ant is ever busy, the earth we live upon ever whirls round and round, the plants and trees are ever employed in their growth, the air is always circulating and the waters are always bubbling and flowing. Look round and say, what religion does Nature enjoin, what lesson does it widely outspread? Everywhere in the domain of Nature, the inherent forces are ever busy in manifesting their presence. Nature enjoins but one religion, and that is Action,—for good, for glory, for health and for happiness of Each and All. “ASPIRE, THEN, O MAN, TO LIVE IN VIRTUOUS DEEDS FOR A HUNDRED YEARS IN PEACE WITH THY NEIGHBOURS THUS ALONE, AND NOT OTHERWISE, WILL THY DEEDS NOT CONTAMINATE THEE.”



To one who leads life of incessant useful activity, how beautiful is the universe ! It is a rich mine of happiness that only requires digging down and taking possession of. And what are human faculties to him ? Speech with its power to soothe and to bless, music with its power to calm and refresh, affections with their mainspring to elevate and to support, and thoughts with their wings to take the loftiest flights and to soar ; these and other faculties are full of hidden beauties. Each organ is pure and holy, as its mission is beautiful and sublime. Can one admire this beauty of the human system, appreciate it at its worth, comprehend its holiness, desire its purity & still remain disagreeable, discordant & deformed himself ? No. He is too alive to the beauties of internal purity and the lustre of inward holiness, ever to linger in the darkness of filthy sensualism or hell of moral decrepitude. Purity of motives, holiness of deeds and loveliness of lives are the internal beauties that he prizes most, and values above all. He cannot degrade himself by destroying this internal beauty, for he is alive to the truth that "TO THOSE REGIONS WHERE EVIL SPIRITS DWELL AND WHICH UTTER DARKNESS INVOLVES SURELY GO AFTER DEATH ALL SUCH MEN, AS DESTROY THE PURITY OF THEIR OWN SOULS." He is rather filled with joy at the glorious capabilities of his existence as the priceless gift of life, is inspired with gratefulness for his endowment of reason, and moved to thanksgiving for the possession of his moral nature. His spirit is moved with gratitude towards Him who pervades all-immensity, animates the orbs of heaven

and the worms of earth, and destines them for ceaseless action for millenniums to come. Where is there an object in the unfolded universe, that does not inspire the grateful mind to sing praises of Him who reigns supreme everywhere, showering beauties and blessings around? In due acknowledgment of our dependence upon Him, our souls rise in worshipful attitude towards Him, who is " *One unchangeable, eternal, intelligent spirit, even more vigorous than mind.*" It is true that "Material senses cannot perceive Him," but the heart bends in homage, ever grateful for the beautiful gifts of Providence. Flavours, odors, colors, sounds and other external impressions may affect the externally-minded man and render him forgetful of the source from whom all these flow, but one, in whose spirit beauty blooms, and gratitude rises with fragrant incense of submissive homage, cannot help penetrating beyond them. He "*withdraws his senses from their natural course, and perceives the Supreme Being everywhere present.*" No more do the delusive phenomena of the world any further delude him. Sensuous charms & external vanities no more blind his expanded and internally-unfolded vision. Far from external strife and in the quiet of his mind, he perceives the Supreme Being that *moves all but himself does not move.* Yes, to the worldly-minded passion-stricken, ignorance-ridden individuals, *He may be far, but to the wise He is at hand,* for "He pervades inside and outside of all." For a mind thus moved with the spirit of gratefulness, discord, discontent and disturbance exist no more. For what are jealousy, hatred, envy, contempt and other discords but different forms of antipathy? and how can antipathy exist, when one has realised for all



mankind a common destiny, when one perceives each spirit moved by kindred influences of the same Providence, each item of the vast universe animated by the same breath and each individual heart flaming with identical heaven-lighted fires. All differences and distances melt away. Humankind is one family. All are brothers. There are no enmities, no jealousies, and no oppositions. Under the patronage of such a mental exaltation, one delightfully led to consider "*all beings as existing in the Supreme Spirit and the Supreme Spirit as pervading all beings,*" and "*cannot view with contempt any creature whatsoever:*" nor can "*joy and sorrow overtake him,*" for he perceives through his wisdom "*the Unitary Spirit that dwells in all beings.*"

Reverence, admiration and love are the only feelings that actuate him whose perception extends to the Unitary Spirit of the universe. When one reflects, how one is moved with reverence even towards those superiorly endowed individuals, who though superior, are fallible, finite, liable to pain, ignorance, disappointment, weakness and their consequences, it ceases to be a wonder that he should be moved with greater respect, admiration and reverence towards Him who "*overspreads all creatures, is entirely spirit, without form, either of a minute body or an extended one, which is liable to impression or organisation, who is the Ruler of the intellect, self-existent, pure, perfect, omniscient and omnipresent,*"—the kind Father "*who has from all eternity been assigning to all creatures their respective purposes.*"

Blessed are they who enjoy the knowledge of this Divinity, this Omnipresent Providence. Excessive joy

dwells in the conscious depths of those who feel the presence of this Great Reality. Life is a rich luxury, an immanent blessing, an eternity of enjoyment and growth. Death is swallowed up in victory. But miserable are they who are tied within the meshes of *ignorance* all around. Insensible of this Great Reality of the universe, can *ignorance* go further? See what a wreck it makes. There is nothing more hideous than *ignorance*. It has been truly said that when man only once becomes conscious of his *ignorance*, it is simply unbearable. Wisdom, therefore, begins with the *consciousness* of *ignorance*. The wise Socrates was right, assuredly right, when he said, "I only know that I know nothing." All discord springs out of *ignorance*. See what a hideous picture it presents. Says immortal Patanjali :

‘अनित्याशुचिदुःखानात्मसु

नित्यशुचिमुखात्मव्याप्तिरविद्या’ ॥

" Fourfold is the fearful power of *ignorance*. It leads its pitiable victim, in the first place, to conclude that this visible, audible universe, the very elements of which are given to decomposition and decay, shall last for ever, that this gross physical body, this *mortal* coil, is the only thing that lasts after death. In the second place, it leads him to the horribly, erroneous conviction that female beauty, beauty which has been styled by some philosophers as a silent cheat, practice of falsehood, theft and the like, the very essence of which breathes filth and impurity, are pure enjoyments and desirable. In the third place, it plunges him into that ocean of pain and misery, the sea of passions and sensualities, in the gratification of which



the blind victim of ignorance imagines the acquisition of pleasure and of happiness. Fourthly and lastly, the victim of ignorance has no conception of soul and spirit. There is no soul beyond this material, ponderable, visible substance." Such is *ignorance*, and as such it may truly be called *the life of senses*, for what is it but a recognition of no happiness beyond sensual pleasures, of no life beyond that of senses; and of no world beyond the sensible one? Surely "*Miserable are they who worship ignorance; but far more miserable are they who arrogantly presume knowledge.*" For, he is not wise who presumes to know more; who claims to carry a pile of books in his brain; or a thick cluster of words and phrases in his memory; or a shower of sarcastic vocabulary in his tongue; or a borrowed magazine of that stuff, which is so useful for purposes of victory in intellectual warfare, commonly known by the name of *arguments*, in his promiscuous storehouse, called the *mind*. Wise is rather he who feels *nobly*, thinks *nobly*, lives *nobly*, and ACTS NOBLY. The difference between *wisdom* and *ignorance* is the difference of opposites. Wisdom is life perpetual, happiness eternal, and peace for ever. Ignorance is all the misery, all the crime, all the sickness, all the evil, that exists in this world. The difference between wisdom and ignorance is all the difference that is possible in this world. They were not wrong who proclaimed *That ignorance, the life of senses, produces one result; and knowledge, the life of spirit, produces exactly the reverse.*

But blessed is the wise man who gets good of evil and nectar out of poison. For a wise man *the very senses*

have a sacred function to perform. This is the function of **कर्मोपासना** (*Karmopasana*),—that well-ordered righteously-regulated religious life which leads to emancipation from bondage, from sin, from misery and from death. Yes, wisdom extracts discipline out of senses, righteousness out of passions, elevation out of affections, emancipation out of ignorance, and yields forth as its fruit everlasting *bliss and immortality*. Of such, has it been said, "*He who realizes both, passes through physical dissolution by virtue of the life of senses, and enters into immortality by virtue of the life of spirit.*"

Many are the victims of ignorance and direful are the forms it assumes. One of them is what may, for want of a better name, be called scientific atheism. This is a belief in the omnipotence of atoms. The externally-minded scientific man, whose mind is replete with conceptions of matter and motion, with dynamical explanation, ever true to his instinct, of never believing any thing except on the testimony of his senses, begins the task of crude analysis. He dissects organised structures, nerves, muscles and tissues, and re-dissects, but throughout all the labyrinths of the brain, all the complicated network of veins and arteries, he finds no trace of an intelligent God, all is motion or matter in motion. He begins his physiological researches and ends in chemical and nervous action everywhere. Again he leaves the organic department of nature; and analyzes and decomposes, and again analyzes and decomposes each solid and liquid and gas, now in a crucible, then in a retort, now by means of heat, and then by means of electricity, here



with reagents, & there with reactions, but meets nowhere with God. On the *positive* evidence of *direct* observation, & from the *infallible* platform of *personal* experience, with his head raised in the *proud* majesty of *knowledge*, and his spine straightened with the *nervous* energy of *natural* forces he bids farewell, a last farewell to the barbaric dogma of a belief in the existence of an intelligent, all-pervading, moving Principle. His belief in the potency of atoms is boundless. They are *unanalyzable*, *undecomposable*, *simple monads*, *uncreated* and *eternal* in their existence, endowed (not by anything else, but naturally through necessity of existence) with inconceivable motions. In the vast *chaotic* operation of these atomic forces, specific atoms met through accident and selection, united together, assumed a *temporary* organization, exhibiting signs of breathing conscious life. This germ of life, on account of wholly unexpected and incomprehensible circumstances, under favorable conditions, (favorable through chance or selection) propagated itself and multiplied. Great was the *struggle for existence*, then raging. Many fortunately organized beings were, in the course of this struggle again hurled back into the atomic chaos whence they sprung. This is *extinction*. But some fortunate organizations (fortunate, not through merit or desert, nor through design, but *fortunate somehow*) survived this dire some catastrophe, and prospered. Their organization modified and developed new organs, and remodified and redeveloped, till man appeared on the stage. Now man, this man, the product of fortuitous combination of atoms, with his heated brain, exudes entirely unsupported doctrines of immortality & Providence. Can a sensible man

believe such dogmas? Vain are thy efforts, O theologian! to construct an edifice of religion on the foundations of sand. Human race, as a race, may, for long ages to come, survive, but individual man shall only go back to the vile dust from whence he sprung.

Such is *scientific atheism*. All is uncertain and unreliable. Life is but an accidental spark produced by the friction of mighty wheels, the blind whirling motion of which constitutes the phenomena of the universe. There is no hope of futurity, no consolation for oppressed virtue or disappointed justice, hereafter. A natural result of which is that the worshipper of *omnipotent atoms* is dashed headlong into a sea of unrighteousness, and immorality tramples all justice without a pang, suppresses all virtue without a sigh, and over the wreck of all that is noble and elevating in human nature builds his philosophy of *desperate-ism*. He is desperate in his actions, desperate in his logic and desperate in his feeling. Or perchance his is a philosophy of *resignation*. Desperate or resigned, there are the signs of brutal violence to human nobility rendered, and as is the case of all violence rendered to human nature, the subject is agitated, disturbed, listless, melancholy, petrified or simply unconscious of himself. Miserable, though, is this extreme form of scientific atheism, there is a softened form of it, however, which is compatible with a certain and a very high degree of morality. For, there is in the scientific atheist, a strong belief, at least, in the unchangeable, and immutable nature of laws, or of the order of nature. He is not superstitious in the world of effects, at least, he is a master. Miserable



and disturbed as his life of the interior may be, his external life is, no doubt, a complete success. But far different is the case of one who, through superstitious ignorance, neither has any conception of the intelligent Ruler of the universe, nor a definite conception of any law or order in the universe, but substitutes for ennobling belief of a monotheist or the *natural* dependence of an atheist, a mean, grovelling or debasing worship of elements like earth, or of objects like stones and trees, or even of bodies of men. Of such degrading and debasing forms of theism, the world is full. There is the homothoism (man-worship) of the Christians, the locothoism of the Mahomedans, the idolatry of the Pagans, the pantheism of the Vedantins, and the polytheism of the Hindus; and all bigotry, dogmatism, sectarianism, intolerance and fanaticism of which the world's history is so full, is wholly attributable to, and is a standing evidence of the misery that these unrighteous forms of belief have wrought. Incalculable are the evils that flow from the worship of things visible. Truly has it been said: "*Miserable are they who worship atoms as the efficient cause of the world, but far more miserable are they who worship the visible things born of atoms.*"

Leading as they do to *widely differing results*, scientific atheism and various forms of worship of things visible are capable of a use to which wisdom puts them, when they are no more those disgusting things that they were. The mighty hand of wisdom extracts out of things visible that sense-education and useful application which is the primary basis or the granite-foundation of all interior development. Man's life-term is thus converted

into a pleasant, instructive, invigorating, power-awakening journey that leads through the invisible portals of death to calm eternal. Not alone is the visible material of the universe thus converted into a rich, useful store for future, but the *invisible undecomposable atoms* also are by the touch of wisdom's hand, seen to be the seat of the power of the Almighty Maker. Atoms are but the vehicle through which the Divine sends forth everlasting energy and life into the visible. Thus "*He who realises both, after death which is the consequence of the worship of things visible, enjoys immortality, the fruit of the realization of the divine power displayed in atoms.*"

Here let us pause, and take a survey of the great eminence to which we have ascended. There is God, the Supreme Ruler of the universe, pervading in all, distributing justice for all, and assigning for each and all, their respective mission. Here is man endowed with potent, active faculties, energetic capabilities, and all-achieving powers, adequate to fulfill the mission to him assigned; and here is a glorious, beauteous universe so attractive, so useful, so harmonious that the heart rises in *utter gratitude* to the Great Dispenser of all gifts. "*O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, unveil that face of the true sun which is now hidden by a veil of golden light, so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.*" O Preserver, sage of sages, eternal light, life of the creation! Gather up Thy rays, so that I may be able to feel Thy glorious presencefull of beatitude. This alone is my earnest prayer. Wonderful is the immortal life Thou



bestowest, and wonderful the justice Thou dealest. Sublime is the process by which *immortal spiritual body* (*sukshamasharira*) is raised out of the gross physical one & supported. For even after death, Thou peoples us in a world, the very enjoyments of which are the *fruits of the very seeds* that here with our deeds we have sown.

"O All-wise Being ! Thou art the source of knowledge inspire us with Thy wisdom, lead us to rectitude, and drive off our evil. To this end, we repeatedly praise Thee and adore, to this end we repeatedly praise Thee and adore.

---

ओ३म्

## MANDUKYOPANISHAD

ओमित्येतदक्षरमिदं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानं भूतं  
भद्रं विद्महि इति सर्वमाङ्कार एव । यच्चान्यत्र कालमा  
तोऽलं तदाप्योङ्कार एव ॥ १ ॥

"Om" is the name of the Eternal and Omnipresent Spirit. The *Vedas* and *Shastras*, and even the whole universe, when understood, declare the nature and attributes of the same Being. He, Om, encompasses the

NOTE—I. *Akshara* has been translated into 'eternal and omnipresent,' See *Mahabhashya*, Patanjali's Commentary, 2nd A'hnika on the Seventh *Shiva* Sutra. Says Patanjali—

अक्षरं न क्षरं क्षिप्यात् । न क्षीयते न क्षरतीति  
वाक्षरम् ॥ अगोतिर्वा सरोक्षम् । अश्नातेर्वा पुनरयमा  
णादिकः सरन् प्रत्ययः । अक्षर इत्यक्षरम् ॥

or *akshara* is that which does not decay, decompose, move or change ; also, *akshara* (from the root *ash* and anadi suffix *saran*) means, that which is all-pervading. Hence 'eternal and omnipresent.'

Swami Dayananda translates the passage thus in his Introduction to the *Vedas*, (*Rigvedaadi Bhashya Bhumika*) p. 4, lines 21-25.



past, the present and the future, and is perfect. He encompasses even what the past, the present and the future do not comprise.

सर्वं ॐ ह्यतद् ब्रह्मायमात्मा ब्रह्मसोऽयमात्मा  
चतुष्पात् ॥ २ ॥

He is the Great God, perfect in all. He is the Supernal Soul of Nature that also pervades my being. The phases of His existence are four in number.

उमित्येतदस्य नामास्ति तदक्षरम् । यत्र क्षीयते  
कदाचिद्यच्चराचरं जगदश्नते व्याप्नोति ब्रह्मैवास्तीति  
विज्ञेयम् । अस्यैव सर्वैर्वेदादिभिः शास्त्रैः सकलेन  
जगतावोपगतं व्याख्यानं मुख्यतया क्रियते ॥

This is literally as we have interpreted.

Our rendering of *Bhutam*, *Bhawat* and *Bhabishyat* is that of substantives meaning 'God encompassing the present and God encompassing the future, unlike the ordinary meaning of mere adjectives, meaning past, present and future, qualifying the word *Sarvam*. Also, we have translated *Sarvam* as perfect. For reasons, see *Nirukta*, *Parishishta*, 14th Chapter, 13th & 14th Kandās, where *bhuta*, *bhabishat* and *sarvam* are given as names of God of Atma.

II. — *Atma*, 'the Supernal Soul that pervades.

मातिभ्यां मनिन् मनिष्ठा । उणादि सूत्र ४ । १५३ ॥

or *atma* is derived from the root *at* and *unadi* suffix *manin*.

अतति व्याप्नोतीति वात्मा ।

*Atma* is that which pervades all, Also, see *Nirukta* III, 15.

जागरितस्थानो वह्निः पद्मः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंगति  
मुखः स्थूलभुगु श्रुतः प्रथमः पादः ॥ ३ ॥

The first phase is the wakeful phase. In this phase, God is manifest as diffused in external nature ; causing incessant interaction among the *seven parts* that constitute the organisation of the universe ; determining the disposition of *nineteen* organ of thought and correlation, that enable organisms to seek their enjoyments in gross palpable matter ; and regulating, with precision and order, the physical motions of the universe.

आत्मा तत्तेर्वाप्तेर्वापि वास इव स्याद् यावद् व्याप्तिमत  
इति ॥

Swami Dayananda translates the passage,

‘अयमात्मा ब्रह्म’

(one of the well known mahavakyas of Neo-vedantins) in his SATYARISHA PRAKASHA p 195, thus :—

‘अयमात्मा ब्रह्म’ अर्थात् समाधि दशा में जब योगी को परमेश्वर प्रत्यक्ष होता है तब वह कहता है कि वह जो मेरे में व्याप्त है वही ब्रह्म सर्वत्र व्याप्त है ॥

*Pad*—phase of existence (from the root *pad*, which means *gati*).

[1].—*Saptanga*—seven parts of the organisation, (1) Head, (2) Eyes, (3) Ears, (4) Organ of Speech, (5) Organ of Respiration.



स्वप्नस्थानो ऽन्तः प्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशति मुखः  
प्रविविक्तभुक् तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः ॥ ४ ॥

The second phase is the contemplating phase. In this phase, God is viewed as living in the interior design that fixes the relation of the seven parts to each other, or adapts the nineteen functions of correlation to the purpose in view, thus interlinking the several ideas that constitute the design, and giving to the universe an invisible but interior organisation.

tion, (6) Heart, (7) Feet. They are also sometimes slightly differently enumerated. Explanation to follow:

एकोनविंशतिमुखः—

Nineteen internal organs of thought and correlation. They are the 5 organs of senses, i.e. of hearing, touching, tasting, smelling and seeing; 5 organs of action, i.e. hands, feet, reproductive organ, organ of excretion, and organ of speech; 5 *pranas* or vital nervous energies, i.e. *prana*, that in the act of respiration forces the air out of the lungs, *apana*, that produces motion from outside inwards, *samana*, that circulates the blood from the heart throughout the system, *udana*, that stimulates the glossopharyngeal nerves and moves the muscles near the throat to draw in food and drink, and *vyana*, that produces motion of the body. (See SATYARTHA PRAKASHA page, 242, lines 15–18); *Manas*, the organ of will and desire; *Buddhi* or organ of thought; *Chitta* or organ of memory; *Ahanhara* or organ of individuality,

*Vaishwanara* has been here translated into God 'manifest as diffused', or 'causing incessant interaction or determining the disposition' of organs; or 'regulating the motions' of the universe. Yaska thus says of *Vaishwanara*, Nir. VII 21—

यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं  
 पश्यति तत्सुषुप्तम् । सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानधन  
 एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञस्तृतीयः  
 पादः ॥ ५ ॥

When the human soul reposes in sound slumber, suspending all voluntary functions, neither willing, nor desiring, nor dreaming, he is said to be *sushupta*, or in the slumbering condition. The third phase is the slumbering phase, where, like the human soul that is folded within itself, God is viewed as Himself, an Embodiment of al

वैश्वानरः कस्माद्विश्वान् नरान् नयति विश्व एनं नरा  
 नयन्तीति वापि वा विश्वानर एव स्यात् प्रत्युतः सर्वानि  
 भूतानि ॥

Which means:— *Vaishwanara* is He who controls and directs all beings, towards whom all beings are led, or who is himself *Vaishwanara*, i.e., One residing in all things and moving them

#### IV—स्वप्नस्थानः—

has been translated into, 'contemplative phase,' for, in dream, ordinarily called *swapna*, it is only the mind that is active, not discriminating between things and their thought. Hence the only realities present before the mind are its own thoughts. It is in this respect that *swapnasthana* has been translated into the contemplative phase.

Concerning the words *taijasa* and *prajna* occurring in the next passage, Yaska remarks, *Nirukta* XII, 37—



ideas and principles, Himself all delight, enjoying but delight, only manifest in His consciousness, and endowed with the highest wisdom.

एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः  
सर्वस्य प्रभवाद्ययौ हि भूतानाम् ॥ ६ ॥

Such is the Ruler of all, the Omniscient Principle, even the Controller of life interior, from Whom has proceeded all, the Source and Resort of all beings.

“प्राज्ञश्चात्मा तैजसश्चेत्यात्मगतिमाचष्टे”

The words *prajna* and *taijasa* signify two modes of existence of Atma.

V,—The meaning of the word *sushupta* is very clear. It means sound sleep. The correspondence between the ordinary state called sound sleep and what is here called slumbering condition, is the spontaneity and regularity of motion without the direct and wilful action of consciousness.

Consider the state of a man in sound sleep. Although all volition is suspended, yet the involuntary functions are performed most regularly. The powers of volition seem to have become materialised or metamorphosed; hence *prajnana-ghana*, which literally means ‘intelligence solidified or embodied; hence the translation “embodiment of ideas and principles” (obs. PANNI’S ASHTADHYAYI, III. iii. 77. *murtu ghanah*. The root *han* assumes the form *ghann*, when the meaning to be expressed is *murti*, or solidification or condensation.

नान्तः प्रज्ञं न वहिःप्रज्ञं नोभयतः प्रज्ञं न प्रज्ञानघनं  
 न प्रज्ञं नापृच्छम् । अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणम-  
 चिंत्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्यग्वारं प्रपञ्चोपशमं  
 शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स  
 विज्ञेयः ॥ ७ ॥

View Him neither as designing interiorly, nor as dif-  
 fused-throughout external nature, nor in the transitional  
 mood between both ; neither embodiment of intelligence,  
 nor fraught with volitional consciousness, nor devoid of

VII.—*Prapancha*, the relative or the conditioned world, i.e.,  
 the phenomenal world from the root—

पचि व्यक्तिकरणे or पचि विस्ताररचने—

*pachi*, to render sensible, or to develop in detail.

*Ubhayatah prajnam* refers to the state midway between  
 waking and dreaming. The word

नोभयतः प्रज्ञं, or, as Shankara says, 'अन्तरा-  
 लावस्थाप्रतिषेधः'

is put to indicate that here we exclude also the state midway  
 between both.

VIII.—The word *matra* has been here given as meaning  
 something that represents or estimates the value of another.  
 See UNADI-KOSH, IV. 168—

इयामभिसिध्यन् । or मातोति साचा मनं वा.

*ma ra* is that which measures, estimates or gives the value of,  
 hence "represents."



consciousness; but as the Invisible, Unimpressible, Incomprehensible, Undefinable, Unthinkable, Unknowable Being, only Conscious of Self in self *i.e.* the Absolute and the Unconditioned, with no trace of the relative of the conditioned world about Him, All calm, All-bliss, One and Only. This is the fourth or the essential mode or existence. This is the Atma, the Universal Spirit. He should be known.

सोऽयमात्मा ऽध्यक्षरमोक्षरौ ऽ धिमात्रं पादा  
मात्रा मात्राश्च पादा अकार उकारो मकार इति ८

Om is the most estimable name of this Eternal, Omnipresent, Universal Spirit, the modes of existence of this Spirit being truly represented by *matras* or the single letters A, U, M, of which the monosyllable Om is made up.

जागरितस्थानो वैश्वानरो ऽकारः प्रथमा मात्रा-  
मेरादि सत्त्वाद्वाप्नोति ह वै सर्वान् कामानादिश्च  
भवति य एवं वेद ॥ ९ ॥

, the first *matra*, means the wakeful phase, or God diffused in external nature; for A means that which

IX.—Here the *matra* A is shown as derivable from the root (*aplri vyaptau.*) *ap* to p *rvade*, *tr* as an abbreviated form of *adi* which literally means the very first step, hence the one who has taken the very first step, or only a zealous beginner.

X.—Here U is shown to be derivable from *ut* *harsha* or *ubhaya*; the former from *krisha* to draw out an outline or mark, hence to design, and the latter meaning both,

is diffused throughout and is known in the first step. He who realizes this (mode of Divine existence), becomes gratified to the full measure of his desire and has taken the first step.

स्वप्नस्थानस्तैजस उक्ताग्रे द्वितीया सा चोत्कर्षादुभ-  
यत्वाहोत्कर्षति च वै ज्ञानमन्तति समानश्च भवति-  
नास्यावद्मदित्कुले भवति य एव वेद ॥ १० ॥

U the second *matra*, means the contemplative phase, or God living in interior design; for means that which designs or does both, *i.e.*, designs & executes. He who realizes this (mode of Divine existence), attracts wisdom towards himself and becomes harmonized. Never is in his family born an individual who can ignore the knowledge of the Divinity.

सुषुप्तस्थानः पाक्षी मकारस्तृतीया सा च मितेर-  
पोतर्वा मिनोति च वा इदं स्वमपीतिश्च भवति  
य एवं वेद ॥ ११ ॥

M, the third *matra*, means the slumbering phase, or God viewed in Himself; for means that which measures all, or is the resort of all. He who realizes this (mode of Divine existence), measures out (a) the whole knowledge of the universe and retires into Him.

अमात्रश्चतुर्थी ऽव्यवहार्यः पञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत  
एवमोङ्कार अत्मैव संविशत्यात्मनात्मानं य एव  
वेद य एवं वेद ॥ १२ ॥



The fourth is no *matra*, for it represents the Unknowable, the Absolute, and the Unconditioned, without a trace of the relative or the conditioned world about Him. He who realizes this, the true ATMA OMKARA, passes from self into the Ruler of self, the Universal Spirit, *i.e.* obtains *moksha* or salvation.

---

(a)—That which measures all, = 'that viewed in comparison with Whose infinite power, the structure of the universe is but finite and measurable.'

---

## EXPOSITION. I

—:0:—

**W**ORSHIP is the first act of pure religion. It is a spontaneous declaration of the inmost affections, as distinguished from the false worship of the churches, where every action is pre-determined instead of being spontaneous, where we have declamation instead of declaration, and pretended show of assumed seriousness instead of free play of inmost affections. Such is not true worship. True worship, on the other hand, is brimful of genuine feeling, profound attraction, and soul-absorbing meditation. True worship, as an outcome of Pure religion, is deeply ingrained in human nature.

Folded within the depths of the human soul lies the germ of all religion. Every human being is endowed with a spiritual nature, a nature that lifts him towards all that is pure and holy, superior and attractive. Not only do the holiness of life, purity of motives, sublimity of thought, and nobility of character inspire us with the appropriate feelings of respect, regard, admiration or reverence; but our aspirations rise high towards the just, the true, the infinite and the divine. It is *this* part of our spiritual nature that is the foundation of all religion, endows us with the sentiment of reverence for all that leads to high and noble aspirations, and with the sentiment of humble gratitude for all that has contributed to our edification and elevation.



Like all other affections of the human mind, the religious affections are capable of being *misused* or of being *perverted* in their use. The religious sentiment, under the effect of excessive stimulation, may exaggerate or portray in brighter colors a simple truth, may over-estimate or unduly estimate the sanctity of an action, and where the sovereign faculty of reason is yet undeveloped, or but very weak, this over-estimation may develop into idolatry or superstitious reverence ; or, on the other hand, where, through want of clear perception, or through want of interpenetration, the reasoning faculties are very active, but discerning faculties comparatively torpid, the consequence may be a sceptical, atheistic or disrespectful temperament. But the elevation felt or pure liberty enjoyed will be exactly in proportion to the *normal* exercise of this faculty. Man, in his ignorance, often worships a false deity. Instead of the God of *Nature* he worships a god of his imagination, a god of fashion, a god of popular sanction, or a god of his own feelings and ungratified desires. And what is the consequence? A life of superstition, unrighteousness, cruelty and injustice. A true mode of worship is therefore highly desirable; a mode of worship, not dictated by false religious education, or fashionable popular custom, but by the higher interests of spiritual nature and by the deepest penetration of Reason. This system of worship, it is the subject of *Mandukyopanishad* to furnish.

It enjoins the worship of the Supreme Deity alone, the **Eternal Omnipresent Being**, the **Supernal Soul of Nature**

For, what but a true conception, knowledge and realisation of this Universal Spirit can be consistent with that overflowing, exultant, blissful attitude of the mind, otherwise designated as worship. The worship of the Eternal Being is the only worship that is inculcated in the *Upanishads*; & this Eternal Being is everywhere named Omkara.

In *Kathopanishad* II, 15. we read :

सर्वं वेदा यत् पदमामनन्ति,  
तपाम्बुमि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति ।  
यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति,  
तत्त पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीमि ॥  
ओमित्ये तत् ॥

Om is the adorable Being, to the study of whom all life of *brahmacharya* is consecrated, or all practice of meditation devoted, and whose realization, it is the object of the four Vedas to accomplish. Or, in the words of *Chhandogya Upanishad*

(ओमित्ये तदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत्)

Om is the Eternal, Omnipresent Being; He alone should be worshipped. Or more explicitly still, in *Mundakopanishad*, II. ii. 5-6.

ओतं यस्मिन् द्यौः पृथिवी चान्तरिक्षम्  
मनः सह प्राणैश्च सर्वैः ।



तमेवैक जानथ आतमानम्  
 अन्या वाचो विमुञ्चथ अमृतस्यैष सेतुः  
 अरा इव रथ नाभौ सहिता यत्र नाड्यः  
 स एषोऽन्तश्चरते बहुधाजायमानः  
 ओमित्येवं ध्यायथ आतमानं  
 स्वस्ति वः पाराय तमसः परस्तात् ॥ ६ ॥

He who *interiorly* and *invisibly* sustains the sun, the earth and the intervening space in their respective positions ; even He who sustains the life of the brain, the lungs and all the various senses, is the Unitary Interpenetrating Spirit. Try, O men ! to *know Him* alone, and leave all other talk ; for He is the only *principle* that leads to immortality. Just *in* the heart, where all the blood-vessels meet, very much like the spokes of a wheel meeting *in* the *nave* or the centre, resides the interiorly-governing Divine Spirit, manifesting His glory in ways multifarious *Contemplate Him*, the Om, this interiorly-governing Spirit, for thus alone can you reach with safety, the blissful haven, for beyond the ignorance-begotten miseries of this troubled ocean of Life.

What, then, constitutes the contemplation of Om ? What is the process to worship Him ? An answer to this question is furnished in Yoga Darshana, I. i. 27-28.

Om is the inestimable name of the Supreme Being who is the Ruler of the universe. To recite this, His name,

and to constantly recall to our mind its profound signification, this is the two-fold process of meditation, called "*pasana*". Vyasa, in his commentary on the two *Sutras*, remarks:—"Om indicates the Ruler of the Universe. Is it by mere arbitrary convention, or by some natural process, just as light indicates the lamp or the source of light? Surely, the relation between the symbol Om and that of which it is a symbol, is not conventional but actual and the symbol but expresses the actual relation. To take a parallel example, the relation between the father and the son is real. The relation *really* exists, before we can express it in such terms as these, He is his father, and he his son. Even in the cycles of creation to come since words signify things not arbitrarily, but by a fixed natural standard, the same symbol, Om, is made to express the same idea. Since it is an established fact with those who know revelation, or those *yogis* who have realized what the relation between the signifying symbol and the thing signified is, that the words, their corresponding ideas, and the relation between them is eternal, or exists in nature and not by human convention.\*

---

\* Perhaps this truth will be more easily brought home to the sceptical reader of the nineteenth century, if it were expressed in the (to us less acceptable far more indefinite) words of Max Muller who says "They (the roots) are *phonetic types*, produced by a power inherent in human nature. They exist, as Plato would say, by nature; though with Plato we



2 The recitation of Om, and the constant presentation before the mind of its signification, these are the two means of His *upasana* or worship, The *yogi* who constantly does both, thus develops concentration, or as has been elsewhere remarked, the aforesaid recitation and relization develop concentration, and concentration facilitates realization, till by the continual action and reaction of both, the light of the Supreme Divinity begins to fully shine in the heart of the *yogi*, "—*Vyas Bhashya Sutra* 27 and 28

The recitation of *Om*, and the constant presentation of its signification to the mind, being the two essentials of Divine Worship, it is of the greatest importance to know what the significance of the Unitary Syllable *Om* is, for the recitation is only preparatory to the presentation. We have only said that *Om* is the Eternal Omnipresent Spirit. This is by the way of indication. But we have not as yet any definite knowledge of the detailed significance of this syllable. It is, however, a very palpable fact that no word is so sacred in Vedic literature as *Om*. It is regarded as the essence of the Vedas, as the highest the sublimest and the dearest name of the Supreme Deity, and is especially appropriated in *upasana*. No Vedic mantra is ever read without a previous recitation of this syllable, *Om*. It is not only because *Om* is the most soft, melodious and smoothly-flowing syllable in sound nor merely because the letters composing *Om* sponta-

---

should add that when we say by nature, we mean by the hand of God."—*Lectures on the Science of Language*, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, London, page 402.

neously and without education of any sort escape the lips of the babe who is just beginning his vocal exercises, but because there is some thing deeper, dearer and diviner in its significance. It is true that whereas other names of God are also names of things temporal, (for instance, the Sanskrit *ishwara* is also the name of a governor, even *brahma* is also the name of the universal ether and of the Vedas, *agni* is, besides, the name of fire, and so on), Om is only the name of the Eternal, Omnipresent, Universal Spirit. That can only be a reason in behalf of its precision and definiteness of meaning, but hardly a reason for the extremely superlative importance that is attached to it. It is also true that Om is more comprehensive in meaning than any other term signifying God in Sanskrit, or, in other words, that it connotes a number of attributes that no other word or syllable singly does, but even that, is of secondary importance. The deepest and, in truth the highest reason is that the signification of Om is the *key-note* of the realization of the Divine Spirit. The several letters of Om, with unparalleled exactness, mark the successive steps of meditation by which one rises to the realization of the true nature of Divinity.

The process of this realization is exactly the reverse of the process by which the mind acts on the external universe. If the latter be called evolution, *i.e.* folding out of the internal faculties of the mind till they become externally manifest, the former should be called involution, *i.e.* folding the mind within itself, till the faculties that were working on the outer plane retire from outside and turn inside



for more interior work. To take a familiar illustration, when an archer shoots a mark, he directs his attention from within outwards with his eye pointing towards the mark in the same straight line with the arrow, he stretches the bow and lets the arrow fly. This is how the mind acts on things external. To pass within, to contemplate Divinity, he withdraws his senses from their outward course, and when the outer activity of the mind is stopped, he passes by gradual steps of reflection, embodied in the constituent letters of the syllable Om, to the more interior and therefore more perfect realization of the Divine Spirit.

Before we begin our exposition of the several letters composing Om, it will be useful to present a rough outline of the four planes of manifestation of mind's activity. The Divine Being is a Spirit, and to realize this spirit we have to pass through his outer manifestations to the more and more interior ones, till the final cause, the Spirit, is reached. Perhaps, our understanding will be much facilitated by taking the analogous case of the working of the human spirit, although it must be remembered, that an analogy is, at the best, an analogy, and not an exact coincidence.

Let us begin with the case of a watch-maker. He has made the watch, and the principles embodied in the watch are doing their actual work. The spring, the balance, the wheels, and other pieces of the machinery, all perform their respective appropriate functions and the minute and hour hands regularly move on the dial. In fact, the skill, dexterity, and designing capacity of the

watch-maker are not only embodied in, and stamped on the watch, but the very material forces and mechanical principles that the watch maker had at his disposal, are actually living in the watch and manifesting themselves by the precision and regularity of motion of appropriate parts. This is the most external, the first, and the most palpable manifestation of the watch-maker's skill. Thus the spirit outwardly stamps matter with its impress. This is what has been designated (in the translation portion,) "the WAKEFUL phase" or the externally manifest mode of spirit's existence.

But secondly, the first watch-maker in the world, before he sat up to manufacture a watch, must have made an *ideal watch*, i. e., must have *designed* the watch. He, must have previously known the principle or the fact of elasticity, its isochronism, the principle of transmission of motion by wheels and pinions, the principle of escapement, the frictional, elastic and other properties of steel brass, iron, jewels, &c, and must have patiently and slowly elaborated in his mind a scheme of the application of all these principles, till a definite purpose could be served out by them. He must have thought out the *pros* and *cons* of one arrangement and the other, and chosen one in preference to the other, till he finally settled upon a mentally perfect scheme of the watch. He must have mentally seen his ideal watch, thus slowly moving, thus ultimately stopping and requiring a winding for possibility of further movement. In short, the watch-maker must have drawn from the promiscuous store-house of his knowledge the necessary items of



information, applied them properly, and for a time *lived in the self-made design*, before he was actually able to undertake the manufacture of a watch. This is what has been called 'the CONTEMPLATIVE phase', or the designing mode or spirit's existence.

And yet, this is not all. There was a time when no thought, not a trace of this design existed in the watch-maker's mind. His mind was a store-house filled with promiscuous information, not yet arranged or applied. And the principles embodied in the watch were not all he knew. Perhaps he knew much more about astronomy, physics, psychology, mathematics and æsthetics, perhaps about chemistry, medicine and ætiology. A merely fragmental part of his knowledge was brought to light and applied. Compared with the knowledge that was actually rendered *useful*, his whole information was encyclopædic. And yet, was he, all the while, conscious of the vast amount of massive information that he always carried about himself? Surely no! In moments of bright recollection, or in moments of practical necessity, only fractional portions of his deposited experiences were illuminated and called forth in conscious array before his mind; but the vast majority of his cognitions still *slumbered* as latent ideas, like congealed, solidified, incrustated bits, in the dead calm, silent chambers of his brain or sensorium. Revocable at pleasure, they were the *invisible* guests of his mind, living for the most part in the background, shaded from immediate recognition by the exquisite, dark veils of oblivion hanging over the chambers of memory. This condition has been deno-

minated the "SLUMBERING phase," or the inactive mode of spirit's existence.

*Beyond* the *wakeful* phase, or the active manifestations of the mind, as embodied in material things and phenomena, like phantasmagoria, projected from within the magic lantern outward on the specular screen; *beyond* the *contemplative* phase, or the energetic display of mental activities, now reconnoitering one group of ideas, then another, now selecting, then arranging, till, as in a dream, woven into a texture, stands before the mind the glowing picture of a marvellous painting, heretofore unconceived; *beyond* the *slumbering* phase, or the inactive repose of mental faculties, replete with tactual or sensual mentalities, impelled to remain by the omnipresent law of reaction, at an imperative rest: *beyond* these and *behind* these, removed far, far away from these phenomena activities and passive modifications, resides the *true reality*, the *substance* SPIRIT, the watch-maker *in essence*. This has been styled the "ESSENTIAL mode" of spirit's existence.

Let us clearly conceive these four modes of spirit's existence, the Wakeful, the Contemplative, the Slumbering and the Essential. Man, in his life, repeats these modes of his spirit-existence every day. When it is broad daylight, and the human mind is fully awake, the eye perceiving colors, the ear hearing sounds, the nose smelling vapors, the tongue tasting fluids, and the body feeling solids, he lives a life in material objects. This is the *Wakeful* state. When the folds of darkness overtake the day, and the ploughman homeward plods his weary



way, when, perhaps, the ignorant laborer tries to forget the severity of his toil in a cup of wine—the active world retires, and so does our model-man. Straight he stretches himself upon bed. The eyelids close as with a superincumbent weight, and gradually the other senses give way, and our model-man has fallen into sleep. Perhaps he is dreaming. Suppose he is a student. The solid walls of his seminary have really dissolved from his view, for he is not waking. Without books, class-fellows, or companions, he is lying on his bed, solitary and alone. And yet he dreams. The examination hall with its flocking candidates is painted before him, himself seated amidst them. The papers are distributed, so to-day, so to-morrow, and the so day after (all in the dream). Home he returns in anxious wait for the result, and lo! a paragraph in a gazette or a telegram from a friend, brings him a cheering news, or, perchance, the news of his failure. Wonderful are the mysteries of dreaming. This corresponds to the *Contemplative phase*. Soon after the dream, or without a dream, he falls into a sound slumber. Where is that living voice, and that active brain? Where are those dreamy paintings? Have they vanished, melted into *nothing*, or been annihilated? Stored in the organisation, though invisible, lie the possibilities of their manifestations still, though congealed and materialized, so to speak. This is the *Slumbering state*. How speedily flows the current of life. Day after day of wakeful activity passes away, night after night of disturbed or sound slumber is counted. And yet, amid these changing scenes, these veering manifestations, man

preserves a sort of independence, his *personal* identity, because he is the *Essential existence*, to whom the aforesaid states are either accidents or non-involving influences.

Doubt not, gentle reader, but that the spirit exists in these four moods. The wakeful mood is the most exterior, the contemplative the more interior, the slumbering the more interior still, till we reach the innermost reality, the essential spirit. And so God's spirit which is diviner, holier, infinite far, *essentially exists, an embodiment of principles, does design and impart life and vitality to all external nature.* And the first glimpse of Divinity that is caught by the dry scientific mind is of the most external kind, in fact, derived from the adaptation of physical motions to one another, their regularity, precision, uniformity, and such that other traits the universe exhibits to a mind well-versed in the study of effects. After the mind has familiarized itself with this, there dawns a philosophical perception of the interior design of nature, with which perception the mind soars higher, till the design itself is found to be the outcome of constitutional and spontaneous tendencies of the Deity, called principles. Contemplating from the platform of these principles, the mind rises to the Fountain of all principles, the Essential Divinity, embodying all in *One*.

These being the successive steps through which the mind rises to the contemplation of the Eternal, Omnipresent Being, the syllable Om, which consists of three letters A, U, M, or अ, उ and म् is made the means of this contemplation; for A presents the wakeful phase, U the



contemplative, and M the slumbering phase, not merely mnemonically but by virtue of their inherent meaning. Hence, the true devotee, in the recitation of Om, thinks of the three letters composing Om, dwells on the meaning and signification of each letter which represents one corresponding phase, and thus lives alternately in the order and regularity displayed in nature, in the design moving nature, and in the principles spontaneously and naturally elaborating design. Since the very lowest phase thus contemplated, involves but the highest generalization of the order of the universe, its contemplation is preeminently calculated to develop concentration & concentration facilitates contemplation, so that ultimately, by the continued action and reaction of both, the light of the Supreme Divinity begins to fully shine in the heart of the *yogi*. Hence the words of Vyasa :

“स्वाध्यायायोगमासीत्, योमात्स्वाध्यायमामनेत् ।”

स्वाध्याय योग संपत्त्या परमात्मा प्रकाशते ॥”

We come now to the explanation of the three letters **अ**, **उ**, and **म्** or A, U, and M.

In contemplating the deep signification of A the *yogi* holds before his mind the vast expanse of the universe with its mighty orbs rolling in their magnificent splendour undisturbed through vacuous paths, carving ethereal waves of unseen exquisite beauty in the ocean of infinity, and contemplates upon the grand meaning of the universe, for in the words of the Upanishad, the mighty volume of nature is spread as a commentary on the nature and attributes of the Eternal Omnipresent Being. The uni-

verse appears to his illuminated vision as a vast organisation of definite parts. And such is the uniformity of plan in this organisation, that even the most distant orbs—whose light, emitted millions of years ago, carried on the speedy wings of ether at the unearthly rate of 180,000 miles per second, has not as yet been able to penetrate the atmosphere of our earth—yea even orbs more distant are organized internally on the same plan on which the solar system, of which our earth is a part, is constructed. To contemplate the wise and intelligent structure of the universe, a structure even as perfect as that of the most highly developed being on earth, man, a structure as well endowed with a brain, a stomach, the feet and the various other parts justly composing the wondrous organism of the macrocosm, let us turn our attention to the sublime mantras of Atharva Veda (X,xxiii, 4,32—34) on the constitution of the universe as typically represented by our solar system.

यस्य भूमिः प्रमान्तरिक्षमुतादरम् ।

दिवं यश्चक्रे मूर्धानं तस्मै जग्रेष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥

यस्य सूर्यश्चक्षुश्चन्द्रमाश्च पुनर्णवः ।

अग्निं यश्चक्रे आस्यं तस्मै जग्रेष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥

यस्य वातः प्राणापानौ चक्षुरङ्गिरसौ भवन् ।

दिशो यश्चक्रे मज्जानोस्तस्मै जग्रेष्ठाय ब्रह्मणे नमः ॥

अथर्व० काण्ड १० प० १३ अनु० ४ मंत्र ३२ ।

३३ । ३४ ॥



Which mean :—

'We approach (in our contemplations) with highest reverence, the Great Adorable Being, who has made this frame of the universe as a living demonstration of His existence, as a highly fitting lesson on His nature and attributes, and who has placed in this wondrous organisation the sun with its luminous atmosphere as the brain, (1) the super-terrestrial space intervening between the sun and the earth as the stomach, (2) and the earth (typical of all planets) as the lower body, the feet. (3)

'We adore the Great Being in whose creation the sun & the moon are the two eyes, (4) and Heat the mouth (5)

'We adore the Great Being who has made the atmosphere the lungs, (6) and the directions of space the organs of hearing. (7) Let us adore Him, the Infinite Being, the source of all Wisdom.

Here is displayed to the mind of the devotee the scheme of perfect organisation. For, is not the sun, with its atmosphere, the brain of this system? The brain in the human body, technically called the *cerebrum* and the *cerebellum*, is an organisation of sublimated elements, a battery of vital powers, the seat of nervous energy, the controller of all motions and functions of the body. And the sun too, like the brain, is a reservoir of sublimated elements, an infinitely powerful battery of magnetic, electric, optic, actinic, caloric and dynamic forces, the seat of all combustible, vegetative energy, and of what has been called in geology by the technical name of sub-aerial denudation; the controller of all planetary and cometary motions. And the super-terrestrial space

teeming with the atmosphere is truly the stomach, the  
 organ of digestion, refining and elaborating the materials  
 consigned to it. It is in the atmosphere that clouds are  
 formed, vapours attenuated, streams of electricity generat-  
 ed, surface particles of earthly salts and metals volatiliz-  
 ed, and the products of all these processes diffused and  
 mixed up, till all is reduced to a homogeneous fluidity  
 carried above the lower strata of the atmosphere, there  
 condensed, and then poured out as pure, precious, plant  
 feeding rainfall. Very like the stomach that, after re-  
 fining, sublimating, and attenuating the food it receives,  
 extracts from its juicy contents the elements of the  
 crimson vital liquid, and pours it forth, like rainfall, into  
 the heart. Before however, the materials pass into the  
 stomach, they have to pass through the mouth, that by  
 the aid of its maxillary organism divides and re-divides  
 the solid food, till it is powdered down and mixed with  
 saliva and thus converted into a fluid material. In the  
 same way, before the earthly materials are consigned to  
 the stomach, the atmospheric space, they pass through  
 the mouth, the Heat. For, what is the channel that  
 transmits the earthly materials to upper regions? What  
 is it that powders, atomizes, and reduces to vaporous  
 subtilty the hard solid materials of earth, or what is it  
 that dissolves these materials in the saliva of nature,  
 water? It is heat that does all the work. Impelled by  
 the restless, vivifying, vibratory oscillations of Heat,  
 solids are dashed into liquids, & liquids into gases. It is by  
 Heat, that gaseous particles, thus endowed with rarity, are  
 borne on the wings of warmth to upper regions of com-  
 parative cold. It is Heat that licks out of the liquid lake,



the watery elements of the atmosphere. Heat is the mediator between the earthly materials and the atmosphere, just as mouth is the mediator between the food and the stomach. And the foot is the lowest part of the organisation, symbol of obedience to the throned monarch, the brain. It obeys the motor impulse communicated to it from the brain through the nerves. So does the earth obey the influence of the sun communicated to it through the ethereal channels of space. The eyes, in the human organism, are constructed to enable man to perceive colors & develop taste. Similarly, the light-beams of the sun, *angirasa* of the mantra, develop the spectral universe, thus standing in the same relation to the universe as the eye stands to the human body. The human lungs are fitted not only to act as the bellows, drawing in and expelling air, or to oxygenate blood, but to draw in invisible elements that directly strengthen the brain. So the atmosphere is fitted not only to attract particles of vaporous matter or repel the suspended earthly particles but to draw out from the earth, especially at the two poles, as if at the ventricles, streams of positive and negative electricity that leave the earth for ever and for good.

The analogy, \* therefore, is complete in every reasonable aspect. The whole universe, to the contemplation

---

\* To impress the reader with this part, only the analogy we will present of slightly differing pictures of the same from different parts of Vedic literature, so that he may be able to form a somewhat general and comprehensive conception of the organization of Nature, and not take the analogy too literally

We quote Yajur Veda XXXI. 13.

of a devotee, presents a brain, a lung, a stomach, a mouth, the eyes, the ears and the feet. And it is thus that the human body is organized. Realizing the perfect adaptation of the mouth to the stomach, of the stomach to the lungs, of the lungs to the brain, and of the brain to the whole body, and also realizing correspondingly the mutual adaptation of the parts of the universe, can he for one moment forsake the Omnipresent Eternal Spirit, so glorious in His manifestation. For, even in the human body, let us inquire, Are the brain, the lungs, the stomach and the other parts in vain, merely to carry out material physical or physiological functions, all unconsciously like pieces of dead matter? Is this beautiful adaptation of parts merely the result of chance, or of mere 'fortuitous concourse of atoms'? Have the blind forces of matter

नाभ्या आसीदन्तरिक्षं शीर्ष्णो द्यौः समवर्त्तत-  
पद्भ्यां भूमिर्दिशः ओत्रात्तथा लोकां अकल्पयन् ॥

God has placed super-terrestrial space in the place of the stomach, sun in the place of the head, earth in the place of the feet, and open space in the place of the ear cavity.

In Mundaka II. 1. 4. we read —

अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यौ दिशः ओत्रे वाग्धि  
वृताश्चवेदाः । वायुः प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य पद्भ्यां  
पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा ॥

The Eternal Spirit that resides in the interior of all things, has disposed the fire in stead of the brain, the sun and the moon in lieu of the two eyes, the open directions of space in lieu of the ear cavities, the Vedas as His organs of speech, the atmosphere as His lungs, the whole Universe as His heart, and the planets as His feet. It is thus that He lives.



met unconsulted, and, after unexpected, unknown and unpredictable clashes, embraced each other and linked themselves into the apparently beautiful organisation of man? No, this adaptation of functions is not in vain. The edifice, constructed of the brain, the lungs, the stomach, the feet, the ears, the eyes, and the mouth, is but the building of the theatre. The adaptation of its rooms is the design of the architect. Surely, the architect made it for some one to act in. Who are, then, the actors on this arena of the human organisation? The actors, no doubt, there are; but they could not manifest their skill and activity without a proper and well-managed stage. These actors are the five organs of sense *i.e.* of hearing, of touching, of seeing, of tasting, & of smelling; the five organs of motion, the hand, the feet, the throat, the generative and the excretive organs; the five vital nerve forces, of expiration, of inspiration, of blood circulation, of glossopharyngeal action, and of muscular contraction, in general; *manas*, the internal organ that originates the impulse to communicate with the external world, and displays the power of imagination; *buddhi*, the faculty of decision; *chitta*, the faculty of memory; and *ahanakra*, the organ of personality. These are the nineteen invisible actors in the drama of life. The human spirit, through the physical temple, manifests his powers of life, sensation, locomotion, memory, perception, imagination, decision and individuality. For how can life be manifested, unless the various parts of the body be mutually adapted, the one supplying the demand of the other, and the mechanical, chemical and electrical forces, generated by their mutual action and friction, be

equilibrated? It is thus necessary for the body to possess an organisation, before it can evolve mechanical and electrical forces in equilibrium with each other; and further, it is necessary for these forces to be well organised, before life can manifest itself. And it is only when life has thus vitalized the body, rendered it elastic, incompressible and vibrous, that it can manifest any tendency towards sensation or locomotion. Not before the principle of sensation is fully established, can preception and imagination dawn; and it is only after perception has provided with requisite mental apprehensions, that the faculties of comparison and discrimination can come into play, and weave the mental impressions into generalized, symbolic ideas. It is these ideas that memory takes in, and so carefully stores. And lastly, it is on the faithful retentivity of memory that the mystery of personal identity hinges, for what is personal identity but that each human spirit feels himself as separate from all others, on the ground of the entirely *distinct* experiences he has had. It is thus evident that the physical temple is but a grand stage well-prepared for the purpose, on which the master-dramatist, the human spirit, sends his vice-gerents, each in his turn, one after the other, to act and prepare the stage for the ensuing. On the stage of the physical temple, appears the first vice-gerent, Life, acts his scene and prepares the ground for the next vice-gerent, Sensation. He, in his turn, plays his own part, and fits the scene for the advent of Perception, Comparison and Memory, in turn, till human spirit himself, in the last, appears on the fully-prepared stage to manifest the



potencies of his *personal individuality*. Not without purpose, then, is this beautiful adaptation.

As with the human spirit, so is it with the Divine Being. Why this wonderful disposition of the sun, the moon, the planets, the atmospheres and the elements in the actual positions, they hold in Nature, but that the Divine Spirit required the organisation of physical elements into a perfectly vitalized body of the universe, like unto man, to manifest His eternal elements of Universal life, sensation and intelligence, and to give His impersonal personality an expression on the outer plane. Hence it is that the *yogi* starts with the letter A of the syllable Om ; repeats in his mind its deep signification ; pictures to himself the seven-organed fabric of the grand universe ; settles himself upon its functional and anatomical organisation ; contemplates its necessity, its purpose, its usefulness, and its reality ; is deeply impressed with the existence of the more interior and spiritual principles (the nineteen principles enumerated above) impatiently pressing for manifestation ; and thence contemplates the All-regulating, All-pervading Spirit, *Vaishwanara*, which is exactly the sense of the letter A out of the three letters composing Om.

And now to the second phase of contemplation. Out of order, comes out order ; out of chaos, chaos. Organised forces acting upon matter will produce organised structures ; a chaos of forces can only result in chaos. Mathematical science is full of proofs of this proposition. Take, for instance, the orderly, uniform, and regular motion of a body in a circle. Mathematicians tell us that this motion is the result of two forces, *centrifugal* and *centripetal*. If

the velocity of the moving body be  $v$  and the radius of the circle in which it moves  $r$ , the centripetal force will be  $\frac{v^2}{r}$ . Thus mathematicians tell us that when a

body is moving in a circle its centrifugal and centripetal forces are balanced by each other and bear a definite relation to the velocity of the body and the radius of the path. This definite relation (or which is the same thing, organisation of the two forces) alone can produce circular motion. Let there be another definite relation, and the motion will be elliptical. Thus it is clear that it is the internal organisation that gives form and order to the outer manifestations. Or to give further illustrations. It is the *internal slow motion* of particles that determines the *solid*. It is the *internal volubility* of the particles that produces the visible *liquid*. It is also the internal *extreme mobility* of particles, producing what is called the excursion of the molecules along free paths, that produces the *gaseous* condition. Or to take more familiar examples still. It is the *invisible, internal* organisation in the seeds that gives each of them the power to reproduce exactly its own kind and no other; and finally, the human spermatozoa, endowed as they are with *internal* though invisible organisation, because of being formed by extracting, through the activity of the vital essence, particles from all parts, organs, and faculties of the living body (अङ्गादङ्गात्सम्भवसि। सामवेद) are only by virtue of this interior organisation, capable of reproducing exactly the human organism. Thus it is clear that it is always the internal organisation of producing causes that develops form, order, organisation or



adaptation in the exterior. Must not, then, the All-regulating, All-pervading Divine Spirit, *Vaishwanara*, that builds up this grand and highly perfect edifice of His Physical Temple, the universe, be also Himself *organised*? Surely the plastic, formative, associative, dissociative principles of the Divine Power, must themselves flow into *definite tendencies*, and be filled with a law of *co-operative sympathy*, causing periodicity in their activity, just to give birth to such precision, regularity and periodicity, as the sun, moon and stars, together with the earth and planets, display in the succession of days and nights, of seasons and tides, of light and darkness, of rising and setting, of eclipses and occultations, of perihelion and aphelion, of forward and retrograde motions, and of the alternating phases of the satellites. And yet that is not all. There are millions, nay billions of organisms of each species—and the number of species both in the animal and vegetable kingdoms is innumerable—each not only growing, living and reproducing its own kind, but also manifesting feeling, sensation, perception, judgment, memory and intelligence, according to the degree of its refinement. Whence this display of wonderful powers and activities? Surely the Divine elements of life, sensation, and intelligence, must have likewise flowed into mutual harmony, fused into unity, and interblended into an interior organisation, whereby to develop such well-endowed and adapted organisms of living beings. Before the materials of the Universe were disposed into the seven parts of which the fabric of the Universe is made up, the interiorly organised Being, *Taijasa*, 'brooded over the design of creation; and before the elements to

motion were appropriated by life, those of life by sensation, and those of sensation by intelligence, thus endowing organisms with various faculties, the same Divine Being, *Taijasa*, lived in the yet-contemplated design of living creatures. To contemplate God in His everlasting designs, in the interior constitution of the universe is to contemplate Him in the 2nd phase, *i.e.* the *Contemplative* phase,' or which is more literally, the 'Dreaming Phase.' For, as in a dream, when man but partially retires from the conscious work and action of the cerebrum ; a so-called physical sleep comes on. The activity of the senses, whereby the internal spirit might have acted upon outer matter, is suspended, yet the mind is not at rest. Playful amidst the many chambers of its cerebral mansion, it collects the materials of its recollected sensations and ideas, and for the time not discriminating between these ideas and the objects of which they are the ideas, weaves them into a texture, and whilst dreaming, enjoys the scene, just as really as though the texture had been made up of the actual objective materials. So is it with the '*Contemplative* Phase.' For although we do not view God as acting upon universal matter and disposing it of in various shapes, yet we view Him, as in a dream, associating particles of matter, aggregating and disposing them, in their respective places, till an entirely complete design is interiorly contemplated. As if retired from the physical universe, God is viewed as contemplating the design of creation.

From this view of the Divinity, which is exactly the sense of the 2nd letter U, composing Om, the *yogi* passes of the contemplation of the 3rd letter M, corresponding



to the third phase, the *Slumbering* phase. We have mentioned that in the state of dreaming the mind is but partially retired from the conscious work and action of the cerebrum. When, however, sound sleep overtakes the dreamer, the mind wholly retires from the cerebrum, only maintaining the life of the physical frame, restoring the vitality and strength of the body, by its recuperative and constructive processes, which take place all of them, so to speak, involuntarily. So let us contemplate the Divine Spirit. Let us consider what determined the flow of the Divine elements of life, sensation and intelligence, into mutual harmony? What made the elements of God's intelligence arrange and dispose themselves into a perfect design of the universe? The human mind is moved to a conception of new thoughts or to a planning of new designs, either under the influence of education or under the stimulation of some keenly felt necessity, or, in a few cases, also through prospective caution. But the Divine mind is not subject to such laws of *education*, *necessity* and *precaution*, as frail human beings are controlled by. The law of Divinity is His own constitution. Unimpressed by any external motive, unurged by any want-born necessity, the elements of God's will flowed into an organisation of design, only impelled by inherent omniscience and constitutional spontaneity. Or, in the words of the Upanishad :

न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते  
 न तत्समो नाभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते ।  
 परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते  
 स्वाभाविको ज्ञानमलक्षितश्च ॥

The Great Eternal Spirit undergoes no modifications, requires no instruments to work with, has no equal, nor any superior. He is the Supremely Powerful Being, *endowed with innate omniscience, omnipotence and activity.* As in sound slumber the circulation of the blood, the respiratory functions, and the recuperative processes are all carried out with greater regularity, precision, and naturalness, only by virtue of the mere contact of the human soul with the body, requiring neither volition, nor design, but the mere spontaneous activity of the soul; so in the slumbering phase, God is viewed as exercising omniscience, omnipotence and omnificence, with the greatest regularity, precision and perfection, without the exercise of strained will, or brain-elaborated design, but by the spontaneous working of the eternal self-intelligent principles and ideas, whose embodiment He is. From this belief in the spontaneous activity of the Divine Mind, there flows a soul-consolation; for this belief, instead of generating *fatalism, or the evils of pre-determination*, creates *strong* faith in the *inherent wisdom* of the self-intelligent *principles* embodied and condensed, so to speak, in Godhead.

Or to approach the subject in another way, let us consider the process whereby the bodily eyes are made to perceive external objects. The organ of the eye has been likened to a camera obscura, its aqueous humour, crystalline lens and vitreous humour, supplying the place of the refracting lenses, and the retina playing the part of the plate of ground glass in the ordinary camera. Just as focussing is necessary for a clear image of the object



being formed, so the appended membranes in the organism are the focussing apparatus whereby the eye is adjusted to any desired distance. The organ of the eye, therefore considered merely as an organ, possesses the power of seeing no more than the camera of the photographer. At the back of the camera stands the photographer who adjusts the lenses, takes the image and perceives it. So is it with the human eye. At the back of the physical eye resides the principle of visual perception, at the back of the ear, the principle of hearing, and so at the back of each sense, the true principle of corresponding sensation. When man has 'shuffled off this mortal coil,' he is no more destitute of these principles of perception and sensation than is the photographer destitute of the power of vision without his camera obscura. The human spirit is the *true embodiment* of these principles. So is it with the Divine Spirit. He is the true embodiment of all eternal, unchangeable principles, residing at the back of all form or organisation and independent of it, and standing at the foundation of all design. He is, in fact, the Supreme Eternal Omnipresent Spirit, of whom the Upanishad says—

अपाणिपादो ज्वनो यद्गीताः

पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः ।

स वेत्ति विश्वं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता

तमाहुरप्रां पुरुषं पुराणम् ॥

He has no physical hands and feet, but without hand or feet grasps and moulds all matter by virtue of the inher-

ent *principles* of Omnipotence and Omnipresence. He has no physical eyes, but He sees all, no physical ears, but He hears all, no internal organ of thought, but He knows all, and is Himself Unknown. He is the Supreme Spirit that pervades All. God is, therefore, viewed in this phase as Himself, an *Embodiment of all ideas and principles*. This is the *Slumbering* phase, the sense of the 3rd letter M, composing the monosyllable Om.

The fourth, a hyatus, which is no *matra* or letter, nor is even uttered or spoken, but is the *true Ineffable Name*, represents the *Essential Existence*, the true Atma, the Divine Spirit, the Invisible, Unimpressible, Undefinable, Unthinkable, Unknowable Being, only conscious of Self in Self, *i.e.* the Absolute and the Unconditioned, without a trace of the relative or the conditioned world about Him, All-calm, All-bliss, One and only. He should be known.

We cannot better finish this interesting, though imperfect and necessarily brief exposition, than in the words of Prashnopanishad, 5th Prashana—

एतद् सत्यकाम परञ्चापरञ्च ब्रह्म यदोङ्कारस्त-  
 स्माहिद्वानेतेनैवायतनेनैकतरमन्वेति ॥२॥ स यद्ये-  
 कमात्रमभिध्यायीत स तेनैव संवेदितस्तूर्णमेव  
 जगत्यामभिसम्पद्यते । तमृचो मनुष्यलोकमुपनयन्ते  
 स तत्र तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया सम्पन्नो महि-  
 मानमनुभवति ॥ ३ ॥ अथ यदि द्विमानेन मनसि



सम्पद्यते सोऽन्तरिक्षं यजुर्भिरुन्नीयते । स सोम लोकं  
 स सोमलोके विभूतिमनुभूय पुनरावर्त्तते ॥ ४ ॥  
 यः पुनरेतन्निमात्रेणैवोमित्येतेनैवाक्षरेण परं पुरुष-  
 मभिध्यायीत स तेजसि सूर्ये सम्पन्नः । यथा पादो-  
 दरस् त्वचा विनिर्मुच्यत एवं ह वै स पाप्मना  
 विनिर्मुक्तः स सामभिरुन्नीयते ब्रह्मलोकं स एत-  
 स्माज्जीवघनात्परात्परं पुरिशयं पुरुषमीक्षते तदेते  
 श्लोकौ भवतः ॥ ५ ॥

तिस्रो मात्रा मृत्युमत्यः प्रयुक्ता

अन्योन्यसक्ता अनविप्रयुक्ताः ।

सम्यक् क्रियासु बाह्याभ्यन्तरमध्यमासु

सम्यक् प्रयुक्तासु न कम्पते ज्ञः ॥ ६ ॥

ऋग्भिरेतं यजुर्भि न्तरिक्षं

स सामभिर्यत्तत्कवगो वेदयन्ते ।

तमोङ्कारेणैवा यतनेनान्वेति विद्वान्

यत्तच्छान्तमजरममृतमभयं परश्चेति ॥ ७ ॥

O! truthful inquirer, Om is the Great God. Wise men attain their object sustained by this Om. He who contemplates A, the 1st *matra* of Om, i.e. contemplates God in the 'wakeful' phase, soon becomes wise, and even

after death is re-born as man, the lord of creation, and by virtue of his previous *upasana*, leads a life of devotion, to study, of control of passions and anger, and of search after truth, and thus virtuously circumstanced, experiences the pleasures of noble nature. He who contemplates U, the 2nd *matra* of Om, or God in the 'contemplative' phase, obtains a glimpse of the interior world of causes, and is, by virtue of this *upasana* transported to the spiritual world, and, after experiencing exaltation there, is re-born as man. But he who contemplates M, the 3rd *matra* of Om, i.e. views God as *Himself*, becomes illuminated, and obtains *Moksha*. Just as a serpent, relieved of its oldened skin, becomes new again, so is the *yogi* who worships the 3rd *matra*, relieved of his mortal coil, of his sins and earthly weaknesses, and free with his spiritual body to roam about throughout God's Universe, enjoys the glory of the All-pervading Omniscient Spirit, ever and evermore. To recapitulate. The three *matras* of Om, when duly contemplated and in their respective order, set free the devotee from the troubles of this world. The contemplation of the first *matra* confers upon him the most exalted state of existence possible on this earth, that of the second fills him with the joys of the spiritual world, and the contemplation of the last *matra* blesses him with *moksha* or *immortality*.

---



## PECUNIOMANIA.

—0—

**U**NDER this head, we propose to deal with the question  
 'how far the pursuit of wealth is a healthy pursuit.'

Says Manu, II. 13—

**अर्थकामेषु सत्तानां धर्मं ज्ञानं विधीयते ।  
 धर्मं जिज्ञासमानानां प्रमाणं परमं श्रुतिः ॥**

It is only those who stand aloof from the pursuit both of wealth and of carnal pleasures that can ever obtain a knowledge of true religion. It is the duty of every one who aspires after this object, to determine what true religion is by the help of the Vedas, for a clear and perfect ascertainment of true religion is not attained altogether without the help of the Vedas.

In the verse quoted above, Manu maintains three propositions ; firstly, the opposition of *artha*, or pursuit of wealth, to the acquisition of true religion ; secondly, the opposition of the pursuit of carnal pleasures to the acquisition of the same ; and, lastly, the advisability of the study of the Vedas for those who would make their it business to investigate true religion.

The first and second propositions of Manu may be regarded as one, for the pursuit of carnal pleasures is in the majority of cases, so interwoven with the pursuit of wealth that it is generally impossible to command the gratification of the former without a previous inordinate accumulation of the latter. We take, therefore, the first half of the verse of Manu to mean that an inordinate pursuit of

wealth is inconsistent with the acquisition of true knowledge of religion. The second half of Manu's verse, we shall deal with some other time.

Had Manu lived in the present nineteenth century—the cry of which from all quarters is, 'the struggle for existence,' or 'the survival of the fittest,' the demand of which is ever something *practical*, either in the shape of money, or of goods, or of materials,—it would have been very bold of him to have asserted the proposition conveyed in the first line of his verse quoted above; for, the actual meaning of it will be that men of the present generation immersed as they are in *practical pursuit of wealth*, are *not, qualified* for an understanding of the truths of pure religion. This assertion of Manu, no doubt, seems to be a very sweeping and insulting one. It is nevertheless true. For the light of religion only dawns on the soil of abstraction, meditation, mental quiet, and contemplation. And the headlong pursuit of wealth, in which the present practical world is wholly absorbed, is so very prejudicial to the growth of these mental conditions, that, in the interests of *truth, religion and higher human nature*, it has become needful for the busy, practical world to reconsider its position, and at least to bestow a thought before plunging into the active labor entailed by the regnant principles of Jealousy, Competition and Ambition. It is true that, under the stimulation of these powerful incentives for material progress, man has become neglectful of his higher duties to *Truth*, and so very true is it that even eminent men of science have begun to feel the dangerous and disgraceful effects of this tendency. Remarks Dr. White, President of Cornell University.—



"We are greatly stirred, at times, as this fraud or that scoundrel is dragged to light & there rise cries and moans over the corruption of the times; but my friends, these frauds and these scoundrels are not the corruptions of the times. They are the mere pustules which the body politic throws to the surface. Thank God, that there is vitality enough left to throw them to the surface. The disease is below all, infinitely more wide-spread.

"What is that disease? I believe that it is first of all *indifference*—indifference to truth as truth; next, *scepticism*, by which I do not mean inability to believe this or that dogma, but the scepticism which refuses to believe that there is any power in the universe strong enough, large enough good, enough to make the thorough search for truth safe in every line of investigation; next, *infidelity*, by which I do not mean want of fidelity to this or that dominant creed, but want of fidelity to that which underlies all creeds, the idea that the true and the good are one; and, finally, *materialism*, by which I do not mean this or that scientific theory of the universe, but that devotion to the mere husks and rinds of good, that struggle for place and pelf, *that faith in mere material comfort and wealth* which eats out of human hearts all patriotism and which is the very opposite of the spirit that gives energy to scientific achievement. \*

Here is an eminent man of science complaining that the society is at present pestered with four fatal diseases, *indifference, scepticism infidelity* and, finally, *materialism*. And the cause of all this is evidently the *modish worship of mighty matter and money*.

In order that this truth may be more easily brought home to the earnest reader, let us cast a look upon the large number of lawyers, physicians, capitalists trades men, engineers, contractors, clergymen, educationists clerks, and other life-draggers in the innumerable fashion-

able professions of the day, that swarm in our own country and whose main object, in choosing the very profession they hold, is the hoarding of the shining gold, so alluring to the jaundiced eye of the competition-sick *practical* man. It is in vain that we seek for a rational explanation of the existence of these harassing professions on the ground of benevolence or of rational usefulness. But for the *filthy lucre* they bring, these professions would never have sprung into existence. Bees do not hum and buzzy so thickly on a lump of sugar, as do lawyers and traders, physicians and contractors at the shrine of money. It is literally true that money is *the God* that is *more* worshipped than the God of Nature,

Nor is that alone, money being the pursuit of almost all Nays, it is the topic of topics. There is the self-styled reformer bewailing over the extreme *poverty* of his country, over the consequent misery, sin and crime that prevails. He is awfully pained to see that arts do not flourish in his country. By long and tiresome efforts, he succeeded in establishing an institution that might have richly improved the resources of the material prosperity of his country; but his disappointment is past all description at the fact that the institution is soon doomed to starvation. Thus meditates the reformer in his solitary moods:—our country is poor, because we have no wealth; sin and misery prevail, because we have no wealth; arts cannot flourish, because we have no wealth; institutions cannot live long and succeed, because we have no wealth. From all sides is the ambitious reformer repelled towards the problem of wealth. He employs his gigantic material



intellect to the solution of this problem. Individual enterprises alone can render his country wealth ; but how can individual enterprises be undertaken without money? Perhaps, there is another solution. He would introduce machinery into his country, and that would yield rich harvest of wealth and opulence. But machinery is costly and a poor country cannot buy it. Or, perchance, our reformer is a *protectionist*. He would not import machinery or foreign improved modes of carrying on industry, but would encourage and foster native manufactures. Unfortunately for our reformer, unwise human nature is mad after cheapness, and competition fells, with its direful axe, the structure of *protection*, so carefully raised by the reformer.

There is the materialistic philosopher. What a charming thing is civilisation ! In accordance with his superficial modes of philosophizing, he analyzes civilization to rest upon wealth. Steamers and locomotive engines, telegraphs and post office arrangements, printing presses and labor economizing machines would vanish into mere coal, iron and sand—fruitless articles—without the mighty, labor-sustaining hand of wealth.

Nor is this the case with the reformer and the philosopher alone. The politician, the statesman, the newspaper-writer, the public lecturer, each in his turn, is hurled back upon the problem of wealth. And thus the world, in its talks and conversations, lectures and public meetings, private meditations and silent reflections, echoes and re-echoes "MONEY," till the whole fabric of society

begins to reverberate, and the atmosphere is filled with phantoms of a like nature.

Reader, carefully observe the ephemeral bustle and transient activity of the so-called civilized society. Do you not note that at least seventy five per cent. of the phenomena, that find their way to publicity in the civilized world, owe their origin to the love of power, love of enjoyment (*i. e.* of pleasures of sense bought), love of honor, love of superiority, love of fame, and love of display? Why is it that the master extracts obedience from his servants? Why is it that men always desire to move in circles of society higher than their own? Why is it that so many *raises* and *rajahs* would willingly incur or maintain useless *regal* expenditure, but to win mere empty titles of Rajah or Rai Bahadur, or Sardar Bahadur? Impelled by imperious love of power or love of superiority, love of honor or love of display or love of enjoyment! And where is the mighty engine to manufacture means for the gratification of these basely inordinate, selfish loves? It is MONEY.

Again, go into the lower strata of society, (by *lower*, I mean *lower* morally, though not necessarily socially,) and see what part the feelings of jealousy, anger, envy, rivalry and competition play in that blind rush of living forces, called civilized life. The constantly increasing litigation, the strifes and feuds of nobility, the corruptions of courts and police, the life-sucking exhaustion of competitive candidates—all bear testimony that the society is at present deeply agitated by wretched feelings of jealousy, envy, rivalry and competition, so unbecoming of man



Where would you find the men, who through benevolence of nature would restrict the operation of vengeance or anger? In the civilised society, hardly any! Perhaps the poverty-stricken, misery-laden wretch, who has not the means to practice the dictates of his rebellious nature, but has only the misfortune to be subject to disappointment and melancholy, may be found, here or there, dragging his life with impatience and restless nightmare. O, if he had the power to wreak his vengeance upon oppressing civilized society! Does not all this, again, appeal to the potency of mighty MONEY?

Imitation is the grand principle upon which society is at present constructed. Imitation is the *fulcrum* upon which hinges the mighty lever of society. Not to speak of custom, fashion, dint of beaten groove, fear of idiosyncrasy, all of which spring in one way or other from the parental principle, *imitation*,—even in matters of religious belief, or in the department of opinions, ninety per cent. of the inhabitants of the world are swayed by the influence of the same all-pervading principle, imitation. Speaking of the same ape-like faculty of Imitation, J. S. Mill says—

‘In our times from the highest class of society down to the lowest, every one lives as under the eye of a hostile and dreaded censorship. Not only in what concerns others, but in what concerns only themselves, the individual or the family do not ask themselves—What do I prefer? or, what would suit my character or disposition? or, what would allow the best and highest in me to have fair play, and enable it to grow and thrive? They ask themselves, what is suitable to

'my position? What is usually done by persons of  
 'my station and pecuniary circumstances? or (worse  
 'still) what is usually done by persons of a station,  
 'and circumstances superior to mine? I do not mean  
 'that they choose what is customary in preference to  
 'what suits their own inclination. It does not occur  
 'to them to have any inclination, except for what is  
 'customary. Thus the mind itself is bowed to the  
 'yoke; even in what people do for pleasure, conformity  
 'is the first thing thought of; they like in crowds,  
 'they exercise choice only among things commonly  
 'done: peculiarity of taste, eccentricity of conduct, are  
 'shunned equally with crimes: until by dint of not follow-  
 'ing their own nature, they have no nature to follow; their  
 'human capacities are withered & starved: they become  
 'incapable of any strong wishes or native pleasures, and  
 'are generally without either opinions or feelings of  
 'home growth, or properly their own. Now is this, or  
 'is it not, the desirable condition of human nature?'

Such, then, is the power of imitation. Who can resist  
 its imperative influence? Can one see the busy, practical  
 world,—lawyers, physicians, engineers, contractors  
 and all—running mad after the pursuit of MONEY;  
 can one hear philosophers, politicians and patriots, all  
 with one cry extolling the efficacy of glittering GOLD;  
 can one see the enthusiastic admirer of civilisation confessing  
 the Omnipotence of the PECUNIARY deity;  
 can one observe the aristocratic hunters after ease  
 pleasure and comfort, the ambitious suitor of power, distinction  
 or title, offering libations at the shrine of  
 MAMMON; or, can one mark anger, revenge, envy,



rivalry and jealousy, all supplicating PLUTUS, to bestow them means of their gratification ; can one see all this, and yet not swear fealty to the sovereign power, GOLD ?

By dint of imitation or example, man is pushed from right to left to seek MONEY. Society is a whirlpool, wherein are caught all swimmers on the current of life, then tossed with violence hither and thither, now hurled this way, and then, the other,—till man is no better than a '*money-making machine*.'

Is not this state of society deplorable ?

See, what a wreck of nobler feelings, this *love of money* makes. Duty clashes with interest. Evils are shielded under the suppressing power of Mammon. The dictates of higher human nature are cruelly set aside and trampled under feet ? Physicians, instead of disseminating the knowledge of physiology, and making the laws of health public, disguise even simple diseases and medicines under the garb of foreign names, & the modes of their preparation, under the mysterious symbolism of prescriptions. Instead of the numerous host of physicians, now existing in the country, wisely administering to the destruction of disease and blooming of cheerful health, their earnest prayer, every day, is, that men endowed with purse and power to pay, should fall sick oftener, and suffer more frequently. Lawyers, instead of breeding feelings of peaceful friendship and encouraging reconciliation, encourage feud and strife, and fan the flames of haughty pride or revengeful animosity. Tradesmen, instead of administering to the wants and needs of the people, and regulating with justice the law of demand and supply, get

all they can, and give as little, keep their trade recipes secret or patented, and delude the ignorant consumers with adulterated materials. Even the preacher or the clergyman, whose business it should be to bestow consolations of simple truth and morality, and to shed the sacred blessings of religious piety and spiritual light, revels in the grand *money-making* scheme of winding up his lengthy, gloomy, affected hypocrisy-infected sermons with a mysterious nonsense, which he himself does not and cannot understand.

It is not thus alone that urged by the society-born instinct of hoarding money, the physician and the clergyman, all alike, are led to the perversion of their duty and avocation. More serious still are other evils into which the society is plunged, but for the possession of wealth. There is the rich wine-dealer, or the opulent tobacco or opium-seller, suffered to live and flourish by his trade in society, and no one ever casts a look of disapproval at him, simply because he is rich. There are thousands of poor innocent people charged with crimes they never committed, and are punished ; but the wealthy culprits, armed with bribe or corruption, influence or intercession, escape with impunity. In spite of the inspiration of the poet and the philosopher to the effect that all mankind are kin, in spite of the weak whisperings of pure religion that all are children of one common Father, is the wealthy class fostering inequality by its constant aggressions, oppressions, iniquities and tyrannies inflicted upon the weak and the poor. Under the strong infatuation of money, even the graduating student forsake



his tastes and inclinations, if he has any, and although fully confident of his intrinsic unfitness for the profession he chooses, he rushes into medicine, law, engineering and service, and floods the world with the consequences of his iniquitous calling. And the newspaper writer, who is never ashamed of calling himself the leader of public opinion, without a pang, delivers up his conscience, and feeds the vanity of the party that supports him. Read the degenerate newspaper literature—for newspaper literature is seldom reforming, regenerating or elevating—and you will see, how little is devoted to sound advice, true leadership or to the cause of *justice* and truth, and how much to party-feeling, sentimentalism, race-prejudice, selfish bias, and wilful misrepresentation. All benevolence and disinterestedness is affected for mere show and ceremonialism, and in truth and in heart, exchanged for base selfishness and combatant sectarianism. Is this humanity?

The conclusion that irresistibly flows from the above considerations is that the '*love of money*' is now-a-days a disease, a form of insanity. Modern science of pathology would be imperfect and incomplete without a record of this discovery of the widest-prevalent disease, that at present infects society and saps the very foundation of morality and religious feeling.

This disease is to be styled "*PECUNIOMANIA*", for, like all other forms of insanity, it produces destruction of mental equilibrium and generates incoherency of thought; it communicates an irrevocable bias in one direction, withdrawing the human mind from all other

channels of activity and exercise; and, lastly, it creates an over-excited condition of the whole system, incompatible with moderation, or normal exercise of functions. Like many contagious diseases, cholera and the like, it spreads its germs of destruction most profusely, and most widely, and is easily caught by the susceptible organisation of man. And like hereditary diseases, this is also easily transmitted from father to son from brother to brother, and from companion to friend. Hence,

*Pecuniomania is a disease of the type of Insanity, very contagious transmissible by hereditation, incurable or hardly curable, of the most virulent type.*

In order that the appreciating reader may have no difficulty in diagnosing the disease, we give below its most remarkable symptoms. Its symptoms are :—unsatiable thirst, or ambition; always hungry stomach; a phlegmatic (filled with indifference) & splenetic (peevish) temperament; extreme sensitiveness and irritability; strong heart-burn of animal and inhuman passions; restlessness, anxiety & sleeplessness; fits of pride, power and feverishness; paralysis of moral and spiritual faculties, insensibility to impressions ultra-sensual or not physical; extreme proneness to over-feeding, over-clothing, indolence, luxury and comfort; an assumed air of superficial independence; personal weakness and infirmity.

And now, we will ask the anxious reader, whether in the name of truth, justice and goodness, a disease that renders man insane,—a disease that sneers at all metaphysics, looks down upon all thoughtful reflection, or Philosophy, and discards all theology as *speculative un-*



*practical, and absurd*;—a disease that stigmatizes all efforts to ennoble & elevate mankind morally, rationally & spiritually as *theoretical*,—a disease that pronounces self-knowledge as impossible—a disease that brings morality down to the level of expediency,—a disease that, instead of the worship of God of Nature, sets up a worst & most wretched form of idolatry, the worship of copper, silver and gold—a disease that denies to man the possession of any nature other than the one capable of eating, drinking and merry-making : we again ask, whether such a disease should not be at once uprooted, destroyed, and burnt never to grow again? For, so long as this disease exists, there shall be no morality, no religion, no truth, no philosophy.

The law of the influx of religious ideas is sound mind disinterested truthful temperament, composed & tranquil attitude ; powerfully persevering intellect and concentrated meditation. And it is the foundation of these very conditions that the headlong pursuit of money undermines. The anxiety and pride, which the possessions of money invariably brings, rob the mind of its composure ; and the complicated relations and interests which the possession of power (wealth is power) always engenders, even takes away the iota of disinterestedness or truthfulness that may have been left ; till, restless through anxiety, turbulent through pride, and biassed through interest, man loses both the power of concentration and of clear thought.

How elevating and dignifying is independence, true, real independence, where man is no more a *slave* of his

surroundings and circumstances, but a *master*. And yet there is nothing that does more violence to the growth and existence of this blissful condition in man than the possession of wealth. A man proud of wealth is invariably a slave of his wealth. A stout healthy man is always in enjoyment of his health. He feels self-conscious of his power, and is legitimately proud of the independence he feels in the exercise of his power. He exerts his locomotive apparatus, whenever he desires change of place or scenery; he takes to physical exercise whenever he desires restoration of strength and vigour; he goes on a walk to breathe the free air of heavens or to enjoy the scenery of nature whenever he desires refreshment; he entertains elevated thoughts and plunges into meditation, whenever he desires to feel as a *true man, a human spirit*; and he rouses the dormant conservative forces of his self-healing nature, whenever disease or extremes of heat and cold attack him. In short, he is amply provided, in himself, with whatsoever he needs. But the rich man is altogether dependent on the tinsel of matter—conveyance by muscular action; plethoric fulness, borrowed from the activity of drugs, or the ministrations of attending physicians, instead of inborn healthy glow; rich viands but impaired digestion which strongly needs the stimulation of the liquor to perform its function, instead of simple diet and healthy stomach; dead photographs, and mute portraits hanging by the walls of his rooms, instead of the scenery of nature; entire dependence upon the cooling power of *panthas*, and the warming properties of fire, refreshing power of beverages, and stirring influence



of wines, instead of natural endurance. Is this the *independence* which a human being should feel?

It is not to this extent alone that the effects of this tendency have extended. Modern civilisation,—a phenomenon, mainly due to the chameleon-like properties of wealth—is brimful of the illustrious consequences of this tendency. The ancient world produced barbarians and savages; because, they were gigantic specimens of human nature, living almost naked in caves or mere huts built just for a temporary protection from wind and rain: because, their wants being few, their arts were simple and not numerous: because, possessed of wowerful memories, their knowledge was all they learned by rote, and their reference books or library, the infallible record on the tablet of their memory; because, possessed of a clear head, their illustrations were so simple and common that their reasoning must appear as shallow: because, being penetrative, they reasoned by analogy, and therefore they knew *observation* only. In short, they were men quite different from what the modern world produces. The modern world produces *civilized* men who are 'starved specimens of human nature'; their architecture is grand and more permanant; their arts are complex and more numerous; their memories are for reference, and more faithless; their libraries are unportable and more cumbersome; their illustrations are heavy and unique because they have been bedaubed as scientific by a process of baptism in unintelligible, classical and technical phraseology. Their reasoning is inductive, their test is experiment; and their logic is the theory of probabilities

Such, then, is the widespread *influence* of wealth no civilisation, both *moral* and *intellectual*.

If, then, the possession of wealth, be fraught with so many evil tendencies and dangerous consequences, let it not be imagined that what is commonly regarded as its reverse, *i. e.* poverty is less so. For, to quote a Sanscrit line—

बुभुक्षितः किं न करोति पापम् ॥

‘There is no sin or crime that is unknown to poverty. By poverty we do not mean the absence of that hard heavy metal, otherwise known as gold, (for how can *dead* substances like copper, silver and gold, affect the physical, mental and moral prosperity of the *living* soul,) but by poverty, we mean the poverty of mind. Where the absence of metal is the only thing to be complained of, industry of muscle and thoughtful ingeniousness of the brain can, with much greater advantage, be substituted for it. But how and whence is to be supplied that deficiency in the true substance of the mind, in the mental and moral stock, which alone is the foundation of all industry, genius, honesty and enjoyment alike? The error of the world consists in thinking the gross material objects of the world to be of any value, in regarding the abundance of such materials as an emblem of wealth. True wealth is the riches of the soul, repletion of the mind with its fourfold endowments, the endowment of *health*, the endowment of will and *muscular power*, the endowment of *intellectual faculties*, and the endowment of moral and *emotional stock*. Let every one who is possessed of a due share of these mental gifts discard



with contempt, the little hard indigestible shining bits of metal, known as coinage, for there is no liberty, genuine independence and dignity outside the exercise of these moral faculties of the mind. Mind is everywhere the regnant principle. The *furious* lion, the *gigantic* elephant, the *ferocious* tiger, the *howling* wolf, the *blood-thirsty* hound, have been *cowed down* by the subduing power of the *superior mind* of man. The wild beasts of the forests have been tamed and rendered docile. The solid rocks have been compelled to part with their quarry the depths of the earth have been forced to yield up their locked-in treasures, the mighty rivers have been made to change their course, the cataracts to give up their impetuous force to the whirling machinery, the water and fire have been driven to drag thousands of tons of loads every moment, at the tremendous rate of 40 or 50 miles an hour, and even the electricity of the heavens has been imprisoned by pointed conductors: all this, *under the guidance and control of the superior mind*. Nor has the material universe, or the animal kingdom alone, been thus vanquished by the power of the mind. Even arbitrary royalty, powerful oligarchy, the aristocracy of nobility (of blood), and the pride of heraldry have been thrown down and surrendered by the democracy of reason, 'the monarchy of mind,' 'the republic of intellect.' And further the pride of aged pedantry, hoary with age, has cast off its self-assumed importance, and learnt lessons at the feet of *superior*, though *young* minds. Even the industrious dexterity, and skillful ingenuity, have bowed under the swaying omnipotence of *new ideas*.

It should, then, be clearly borne in mind that the richness of mind, is the true richness. It is the undecayable wealth that deserves the greatest respect and highest reverence. Physical, material wealth, should be the lowest thing in our estimation. Says Manu—

वित्तं बन्धु वयः कर्म विद्या भवति पंचमो ।  
एतानि मान्यस्यानाति गरीयो यद्यदुत्तरं ॥

"Wealth, nobility of blood, age, professional skill or honest industry and knowledge (the wealth of mind), these are the five things to be respected, the one following more than the one preceding it." This truth has been amply illustrated in the remarks made above, concerning the superiority of the mind. The conclusion to be cherished is that the possession of *mental riches* is the best possession, and that *the pursuit of these* (as contradistinguished from the pursuit of wealth), *is the pursuit that is becoming of the nobility of human nature*. Mind is the true source of power, ideas (or knowledge) are the true wealth, before which all else crumbles to dust, to rise no more. Says the Upanishat—

आत्मना विन्दते वीर्यं विद्यया विन्दते ऽमृतम् ॥

True power comes from the spirit, and immortality from the possession of ideas.

---



## आत्माधिकारः

आत्मत्वाभिसम्बन्धादात्मा, तस्य सौक्ष्म्यदपत्यक्षत्वे  
 सति करणैः शब्दाद्युपलब्धानुमितैः श्रोत्रादभिः सम-  
 धिगमः क्रियते, वास्यादीनामिव करणानां कर्तृप्र-  
 योजनत्वदर्शनात्, शब्दादिषु प्रसिद्धा च प्रसाधको  
 ऽनुमीयते, न शरीरेन्द्रियमनसां चैतन्यसंज्ञत्वात् ।  
 न शरीरस्य चैतन्यं, घटादिवद्भूतकार्यत्वान्मृते  
 चासम्भवात्, नेन्द्रियाणां करणत्वादुपहतेषु विषया-  
 सान्निध्ये चानुस्मृतिदर्शनात्, नापि मनसः करणा-  
 न्तरानपेक्षित्वे युगपदालोचनानुस्मृतिप्रसङ्गात् स्वयं  
 करणभावाच्च, पारिशेष्यादात्माकार्यत्वाच्चेतनात्मा-  
 समधिगम्यते । शरीरसमवायिनीभ्यां च हिताहित-  
 प्राप्तिपरिहारयोग्याभ्यां प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिभ्यां रथकर्मणा  
 सारथिवत्प्रयत्नवान्निग्रहस्याधिष्ठातानुमीयते । प्रणा-  
 दिभिश्च कथं शरीरपरिगृह्यते वायौ विकृतकर्मदर्श-  
 नाद्भस्मध्मापयितेव, निर्मेषोष्मेषकर्मणा नियतेन  
 दारुयन्त्रप्रयोक्तेव, देहस्य वृद्धिचतुर्भग्नसंरोहणादि  
 निमित्तत्वाद्गृहपतिरिव, अभिसतविषयग्राहककरण-

समृन्धनिमित्तेन मनःकर्मणा गृहकोणेषु पेलकप्रेरण  
 इव दारकः, नयनविषयालोचनान्तरं रसानुस्मृतिप्रकृ-  
 मेण रसनविक्रियादर्शनादनेकगवाक्षांतर्गतप्रेक्षकवदु-  
 भयदर्शी कश्चिदेको विज्ञायते । बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेष-  
 प्रयत्नेषु गुणैर्गुण्यनुमोयते । ते च न शीरेन्द्रियगुणाः,  
 कस्मादहं करेणैक्यवाक्यताभावात्प्रदेशवृत्तित्वादयाव-  
 द्रव्यभावित्वाद्वाह्येन्द्रियाप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च तथाहंशब्देन  
 पृथिव्यादिशब्दव्यतिरेकादिति । तस्य गुणा बुद्धिसुख-  
 दुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नधर्माधर्मासंस्कारसंख्यापरिमाणपृथ-  
 क्संयोगविभागाः । आत्मलिङ्गाधिकारि बुद्ध्यादयः  
 प्रयत्नान्ताः सिद्धाः धर्माधर्मावात्मान्तरगुणानामकार-  
 णत्ववचनात्, संस्कारः स्मृत्युत्पत्ती कारणत्ववचनात्,  
 व्यवस्थावचनात् सङ्ख्या, पृथक्त्वमत एव, तथाचात्मे-  
 ति वचनात्परममहत्परिमाणम्, सन्निकर्षजत्वात्सु-  
 खादीनां संयोगस्तद्विनाशकत्वादिभाग इति ॥

॥ प्रशस्तपादभाष्य अत्माधिकरणम् ॥



## EVIDENCES OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT

---

**H**OW painful is *ignorance*. Patanjali says that ignorance is the only soil where evils can grow & germinate.\* And so it is. All the evil of this world is the result of *misdirection* of natural forces, ultimately traceable to *ignorance*. Nowhere is ignorance however so baneful as when it appertains to the ignorance of one's own self. Under the stunning effect of ignorance people imagine themselves to be deprived of their own vital essence. And the so-called theologies of the world, no less than the materialistic objective externalism of the day, are busy in propagating scepticism, and even downright nihilism, on the subject. As a matter of fact, more is due in this direction to the pious teachings of the so-called religious world than to the sincere and logically-arrived convictions of philosophers and scientific men. The conclusions arrived at by sincere investigators & unprejudiced, unbiased reasoners, are, at the worst, only doubtful and fluctuating. They terminate in the confession of a mystery, or of some indefinite relation between mind and body. But our wise theologians of all religions go further. Their assertions are positive, dogmatic, and leave no room for doubt. The pious missionary, who believes in the perfected political religion of the western world, *i.e.* popular Christianity refined, returns this unequivocal answer to the query—What is human spirit? "And the Lord God formed man ( Adam ? ) of the

---

\* Yoga aphorism, ii. 4.

dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living soul."† And Mahomet's doctrine of *Nafakht Fih*, as given in the Qoran, is but a reiteration of the same, an echo of the *biblical* account in every sense. *Thus* is the grand problem of life and death solved by the Mohomedan and Christian worlds alike ; and *thus* is the human spirit declared to be a mere breath. Faithful to the instincts of his *atheistic* Christian land, poet-laureate Tennyson thus puts the answer in the mouth of personified Nature:—

"Thou makest thine appeal to me :

I bring to life, I bring to death :

The spirit does but mean the breath :

I know no more."‡

Not only is the human spirit, then, deprived of his proper functions and powers, but even scared out of existence. Apart from the absurdity of the supposition, for the Great Eternal Being must have become almost tired—so as to require almost rest on every (?) seventh day of so constantly blowing out of his exhausting lungs breaths of vital fire, to keep alive so many millions of millions of living beings,—living upon the innumerable worlds inhabiting the infinite space, the doctrine is in itself highly pernicious and misleading. For, what can be more pernicious than this, that a human being should be declared to be a void, a phantom, a breath, and no more.

---

† Genesis, II. 7.

‡ In Memoriam, LV1, 2,



Once admit that the human spirit is not a substance, or an entity, as real as palpable matter, (nay it is more real); once admit, like Bauddhas, that human life is but an evanescent spark, passing off like a transient meteor in the sky; or, like Christians, that it is a mere breath; or like modern subjective evolutionists that 'spirit' is only a conception inherited by the civilized races from their savage progenitors, who formed it, misled by the delusive phenomena of dreams, wherein a savage is represented to dream a friend coming and talking to him, whereas on awakening, he finds that the friend is nowhere, thus giving to the savage a notion, that every human being must have got a corresponding invisible second self, that appears in dreams, but is not tangible; once admit the airy nothingness of the human spirit, and down goes with it the whole fabric of all religion and morality. Can *supernatural* Christianity, with its *gratis* scheme of salvation, be based upon this sand-foundation of spirit-notion? O vain Christian! wipe off your theology and your scheme of salvation, for there is no human spirit to be saved. That which you would save, is but a phantom, a mere breath. It is no substantiality. And ye Mahomedans! get rid of your doctrine of prophetic interposition, for interposition will only save a phantom, that has already disappeared, or would perhaps be destroyed the next moment. And all ye, who believe in the generation<sup>o</sup> of human spirits, i.e. in its creation out

---

\* "Generation, progress and eternal existence are the characteristics of soul." Brahmo Samaj Tracts, Sad dharma Sutram, translated by Navina Chandra Rai, Chapter III, Sutra, 35

of nothing by the fiat of the Deity, understand that what sprang into existence out of nothing will fall back into the chaos, out of which it sprang, and be resolved into nothing!

This superstition, or misimpression of the non-entity of spirit, is not confined to the primary strata of religion alone. It has begun to permeate through the civilized world, till it has reached the margin of 'scientific speculation.'

'The mechanical theory of the universe undertakes not only to account for all physical phenomena by describing them as variances in the structure or configuration of material systems,' but strives even to apprehend all vital and physiological phenomena by reducing them to the elements of mass and motion. Thus Wundt, speaking of physiology, says, "The view that has now become dominant (in physiology), and is ordinarily designated as the mechanical or physical view, has its origin in the causal conception long prevalent in the kindred departments of natural science, which regards nature as a single chain of causes and effects wherein the ultimate laws of causal action are the laws of mechanics. Physiology thus appears as a branch of applied physics, its problem being a reduction of vital phenomena to general physical laws, and thus ultimately to the fundamental laws of Mechanics." Again, says Professor Haeckel in clearer terms, "The general theory of evolution .....assumes that in nature there is a great unital, continuous and everlasting process of development, and that all natural phenomena, without exception, *from the motion of the celestial bodies and the fall of the rolling*



*stone up to the growth of the plant and the consciousness of man*, are subject to the same great law of causation—that they are ultimately to be reduced to atomic mechanics." Not this alone, but Haeckel further declares that this theory "is the only scientific theory which affords a rational explanation of the universe, and satisfies the craving of the intellect for causal connections, inasmuch as it links all the phenomena of nature as parts of a great unitary process of development and as a series of mechanical causes and effects." † Working under the charms of this mechanical theory of the universe, Dr. Buchner, in his "Matter and Force" denies even existence to psychology or subjective philosophy. Many regard matter and its chemical workings as sufficient to account for all force and all mind. The notion of personality, immortality or independence of matter are again discarded by some as superstitious and absurd. Thus it is with philosophers and scientific men, who live from day to night in dread of utter annihilation.

Notwithstanding the fact that such materialism has long prevailed and even now prevails in the strongholds of Science and Religion in Western countries, it is remarkable to note that there have been from time to time men who have fearlessly explored the regions of nature and made attempts at understanding and stating the bare truth.

Deep researches in physiology have revealed the facts that the human organisation is endowed with a self-conservative energy. And physicians and medical men in

---

† Stallé's Concepts of Modern Physics, pp. 19—20.

different ages have come to the conclusion, on the basis of their medical experience with the sick and the diseased, that there is in the human organisation a self-healing power which goes to restore the sick & throw off disease, and that medicines are only aids to this healing power. Thus, Von Helment was obliged to recognise a principle which he called "Archeus," and regarded it as independent of inert and passive matter—a principle that presided over all diseases and inspired the proper medicines with vitality enough to heal or to restore. The same principle was called by Stahl "*anima*," and was regarded as supplying losses and repairing injuries, besides overcoming diseases. The same principle was called by Whytt, "the sentient principle." It was differently styled by Dr. Cullen, who called it the *vis medicatrix naturae*; by Dr. Brown, who called it the *Caloric*; by Dr. Darwin, who named it "*Sensorial energy*;" by Rush, who called it "*occult cause*"; by Brousaïs, who called it "*vital chemistry*"; and by Hooper, who calls it the "*vital principle*." Living power, Conservative force, Economy of human nature, and Powers of life, these & many such others have been the names by which the same principle has been called.

Whereas physicians and medical men have proceeded on the one side to approach the belief in a vital principle theoretic speculation on biology has advanced far enough to probe the question of the genesis of life. And honest investigators and sincere writers have been compelled to recognize that "life, however, may also be considered as a *cause*, since amongst the phenomena presented by all living beings, there are some which cannot be re-



ferred to the action of known physical or chemical laws, and which therefore temporarily, at any rate, we must term "vital."<sup>o</sup>

It has also been maintained that there is a plastic carbon-compound, called protoplasm, composed of four inseparable elements—Carbon, Oxygen, Hydrogen, and Nitrogen,—which is the physical basis of life, and consequently very often the doctrine of organisation-genesis of life has been urged. But to do justice to this physical basis of life, it must be remarked that although the presence of these four elements apparently fixes it as a physical basis, yet, that it possesses always a definite composition, is very much doubted. "It has not yet been shown that the living matter which we designate by the convenient term of "protoplasm" has universally and in all cases a constant and undeviating chemical composition; and indeed there is reason to believe that this is not the case." † Furthermore, in consideration of the vital phenomena presented by the lowest animals, scientific authorities have been obliged to confess that organisation is not an intrinsic and indispensable condition of vital phenomena. Speaking of *Amoeba*, remarks Professor Nicholson, "This animalcule which is structurally little more than a mobile lump of semi-fluid protoplasm, digests as perfectly—as far as the result to itself is concerned—as does the most highly organized animal with the most complex digestive apparatus. It takes food into its interior, it digests without the presence of a single organ

---

\* Nicholson's Manual of Zoology, 6th Edition, page 7.

† *Ibid* p 9 note.

for the purpose ; and, still more, it possesses that inexplicable selective power by which it assimilates out of food such constituents as it needs, whilst it rejects the remainder. In the present state of our knowledge, therefore, we must conclude that even in the process of digestion, as exhibited in the Amoeba, there is something that is not merely physical or chemical. Similarly any organism, when just dead, consists of the same protoplasm as before, in the same form, and with the same arrangements ; but it has most unquestionably lost a thing by which all its properties and actions were modified, and some of them were produced. What that something is, we do not know, and perhaps never shall know ; and it is possible, though highly improbable, that future discoveries may demonstrate that it is merely a subtle modification of some physical force.....It appears, namely, in the highest degree probable that every vital action has in it something which is not merely physical and chemical, but which is conditioned by an unknown force, higher in its nature and distinct in kind as compared with all other forces. The presence of this vital "force" may be recognized even in the simplest phenomena of nutrition ; and no attempt even has hitherto been made to explain the phenomena of reproduction by the working of any known physical or chemical force.\*

Speaking of the same, Professor Huxley remarks :—  
 "It seems difficult to imagine a state of organisation lower than that of *Gregarinida*, and yet many of the *Rhizopoda* are still simpler. Nor is there any group of the animal

---

\* Nicholson's Zoology, pp. 12—13.



kingdom which more admirably illustrates a very well founded doctrine, and one which was often advocated by John Hunter, that life is the cause and not the consequence of organisation, for in these lowest forms of animal life, there is absolutely nothing worthy of the name of organisation to be discovered by the microscopist, though assisted by the beautiful instruments that are now constructed. In the substance of many of these creatures, nothing is to be discovered but a mass of jelly, which might be represented by a little particle of thin glue. Not that it corresponds with the latter in composition, but it has that texture and sort of aspect; it is structureless and organless and without definitely formed parts. Nevertheless, it possesses all the essential properties and characters of vitality; it is produced from a body like itself, it is capable of assimilating nourishment and of exerting movements. Nay, more, it can produce a shell; a structure in many cases, of extraordinary complexity and most singular beauty.

"That this particle of jelly is capable of guiding physical forces, in such a manner as to give rise to those exquisite and almost mathematically arranged structures—being itself structureless and without permanent distinction or separation of parts—is, to my mind, *a fact of the profoundest significance.*"\*

The irresistible conclusion to which the above leads and which Haeckel also holds, is that the forms, of their

---

\* An introduction to the classifications of animals by Thomas Henry Huxley L.L.D.F.R.S., London, 1869, Page 10-11.

organisms and of their organs result entirely from their life." It is clear, then, that by whatsoever name it may be called, *life, vital principle, organising principle, occult cause, sensorial energy, vis medicatrix naturæ, anima*, or so many other names, modern scientific world has come face to face with a dynamic physiological reality which they call life. It is no more a mere phantom, or a mere product of organisation. It is rather a *subtle, refined, invisible, dynamic substance*, a reality that builds up the organisation, causes growth, vitality, and motion, repairs injuries, makes up losses, feeds, feels, is sentient, originates actions, resists, overcomes and cures disease. This is the irresistible conclusion to which physiological researches have led sincere investigators and philosophers in western countries. Thus it is that they have been compelled to admit a reality, (call it material if it will please you), yet, a reality, which the ancient philosophers of the east styled *Atma*.

If we have purposely avoided mentioning ancient eastern authorities on the subject, it is for the plain reason that India of the present day derives its intellectual activity, faith, belief and conviction mainly from civilized occidental England. Had we, in the very beginning, culled evidence from ancient Sanskrit authors just to prove even these very positions literally, there is no doubt that these remarks would have been unhesitatingly pronounced as superstitious, whimsical, unscientific and old-grown; although, even after the best evidence from western authors on the subject has been collected, there is not to be found that systematic, exhaustive enumera-



tion of evidence which is the characteristic of a settled or decided opinion.

To come, however, to the proper subject, "Evidences of the human spirit from the standpoint of *Vaisheshika* philosophy." As already pointed out, the ancient philosophers of Aryavarta styled this *vital principle Atma*. It is to be remembered that *Atma* is one of the nine *dravyas* of the *Vaisheshika* philosophers. A *dravya*, in *Vaisheshika* philosophy, is something in which attributes and actions inhere,\* or what in English philosophy would be called a substance, or better still, a *substratum* or a *noumenon*. It is clear, then, that *Atma* is a reality, one of the nine noumena of the universe, a substance in which attributes and actions inhere.

Let us, therefore, divest ourselves of our previous notions concerning the human spirit, so that we may the better understand its nature, according to this philosophy. English metaphysicians having generally regarded the human spirit as an immaterial nothing something, have been unable to offer any explanation as to how the mind knows the external universe and acts on it. Regarding the human mind as they did, as altogether immaterial, *i. e.* as divested of all the properties of matter, even of the substantiality and extension or space-occupation of matter, they found their intellects compelled to halt, when the problem of the cognition of the external world

---

\*क्रियागुणवत् समवायिकारणमिति द्रव्यलक्षणम्।

*Vaisheshika Sutra I. i. 15.*

was presented to them. In vain, did they attempt to solve the problem by referring cognitions to *impressions* of external matter, or to *correspondences* produced by the Divine energy; for the problem still remained the same.

A soft, plastic melting bar of wax is taken, spread upon a surface, and a hard, rigid, solid, carved design imprinted upon it. The wax easily takes the design upon it. This is the impression on the wax. It was similarly urged, that external objects which are material, cannot be perceived by the altogether immaterial spirit directly, for we cannot conceive of any action between things that have no properties in common, for instance, such as mind and matter—mind, which is almost altogether ideal, invisible, impalpable, phantom-like airy nothing; and matter, which is independently existing, external, real, visible, tangible, and perceptible. It was therefore asserted that what takes place in the perception of things is this. The sensorium first takes the impression of things external, and it is this impression in the sensorium which is ultimately perceived by the spirit. But this does not solve the problem. For, if the sensorium takes the impression of objects external, however soft, plastic and liquidous the sensorium may be, it must be yet material: for, no matter what the substance may be, a material substance can only leave impressions on a material something. The sensorium, therefore, must be itself material, if it can be impressed by external matter at all. If, then, the sensorium itself be material, as we are compelled to believe it is, the problem has not been solved



for, the difficulty still remains as to how the altogether immaterial mind can perceive the material and therefore external impressions on the sensorium.

Some philosophers have maintained that Divine interposition is the only means of getting rid of this difficulty. They, therefore, theorize that the Divine Being, the Spirit of God, through omnipotence, works out the material phenomena of nature in the physical external world on one hand, and corresponding internal mental changes directly in the world of mind, on the other; that thus, we are every moment conscious, not of matter and material phenomena, but of corresponding mental phenomena, existing independently by the direct working of the Divine Will. It is needless to say that this theory, instead of explaining the cognition of the external world, cuts short the Gordian knot by utterly denying the very existence of any such cognition at all. It not only robs us of our cognition, but robs us of the very external world itself, for if we be not conscious of the external world, but of mental changes only, say, correspondingly worked out by Divine interposition, what proof have we that any such external world exists?

This difficulty of explaining the cognition of the external world becomes augmented still further, when we come to consider the parallel and correlate question of the action of the human spirit upon matter. Here, may lie a heavy mass of iron, say, 20 seirs in weight. At the command of the spirit, the arm rises, and the weight is lifted up. Here is another mystery to be explained. How can the altogether immaterial spirit lift up the altogether material and external weight of twenty

seirs ? Replies the impatient reader, the weight is moved in consequence of the movement of the hand. But, who moved the equally material hand ? One may go a step further and say that the feat was accomplished by a regular contraction of the muscles, but the muscles are material still, and the question still remains, Who contracted the muscle ? Here the vain physiologist may say that there passed a nervous current from the brain and straight contracted the muscle. But the question still flutters before the mind, What stimulated the nervous currents ? You answer, the will of the spirit. And here lies the question of questions, How could the *immaterial spirit* stimulate, by his *immaterial will*, the solid, white, fibrous, silvery *material* nerves to yield up their nervous fluid and contract the muscle ? It is plain, then, that there can be no escape from the final riddle : and whence this riddle ? Clearly enough from the preconceived erroneous notion that the spirit is an altogether *immaterial* airy nothing, phantom-like, or breathly something.

Once admit, as the *Vaisheshika philosophy* teaches, that the *Atma* human spirit, is at least as good a substance as matter, as good a noumenon or substratum, as ordinary external objects are possessed of, and it will be clear how substance can act upon substance or be impressed by substance. This peculiar substance *Atma* is the seat of two grand manifestations, the voluntary and the involuntary. The voluntary or conscious functions of *Atma* are the functions, called cognition, feeling and will, also called *Buddhi*—consciousness, *sukha*—feeling of pleasure,



*dukkha*—the feeling of pain, *ichchha*—desire, *dvesha*—repulsion, and *prayatna*—conscious exertion. These voluntary functions of the spirit have formed the basis of discussions of all metaphysicians who have ignorantly or wilfully neglected the treatment of the other set of functions—*pranapana* or respiration, *nimeshonimesha* or nictitation, *jivana* or physiologic building and animation, *mana*, or sensation, *gati* or movement, *indriya* or activity of the senses, and *antaravikara* or organic feelings. The result of the separation of these two sets of the functions of the spirit has been that schools of metaphysicians and scientific men have been set up in conflict with each other, both denying the substantiality of the spirit. The metaphysicians deny the substantiality of the spirit, evidently on the ground that sensations, feelings, wills, desires and ideas, perceptions and cognitions have no independent existence of their own, but seem to be manifested only in organised structure. There is besides a tendency among metaphysicians to regard whatsoever is internal or mental as imaginary, or as phenomenal but not as real or substantial. Hence dealing as they do, with the departments of feeling, cognition and will, they regard the mind no more real than its phenomena. Had they also recognized the involuntary functions of the spirit, they would have readily perceived that the *real* something which produces such tangible, real phenomena as the building up of structures or the animation of organism, or which produces motion and the co-ordination of motion, is the reality that sentiently feels, knows and wills.

On the other hand, the scientific world has been prone to deny substantiality to spirit from the opposite ground that their external phenomenal researches into the functions of organisms could only reveal to them, at their best, the involuntary potencies of the spirit and this could not otherwise happen. For the whole material world, from the psychological point of view, is merely objective existence. The human spirit is the only substance that is both objective and subjective at the same time. The scientific world, owing to its materialism and the deep-seated tendency of only depending on sense testimony, have only sought the objective side of the human spirit, and have therefore landed themselves into a nihilism which denies the subjective side of the human spirit. Not finding the involuntary tendencies of the spirit anywhere outside of organic matter—for, then, they would not be manifest, they have denied to consciousness an independent substratum. For it is to them, more agreeable and uniform, to regard life also as one of the forces, and since consciousness has no place in this list of forces, it must be the apparent, delusive result of the most complicated working of natural forces. To them, matter with its chemical affinity is all-sufficient. Had both sets of functions, voluntary and involuntary of the human spirit, been simultaneously viewed, no darkness would have enshrouded the realm of mind. It would have been perceived that the human spirit, in performing what are called the involuntary functions of the mind, behaves just in the same way as different elements of matter do. The spirit too, with its inherent chemical



affinities and dynamic activities, attracts and repels blood from the heart, air from the lungs and nervous currents or electricity from the brain. This double-phased existence of *Atma* is the subject of the quotation from the *Prashastapada Bhashya* of Gautama, which we have placed in the beginning of our brief review. A rough and almost literal translation of the passage is herewith subjoined :—

“The next substance is called *Atma*, as it is endowed with the property of circulating itself freely in the organism. On account of its being a refined and subtle entity, it is *imperceptible* by the senses ; and, hence, its existence has to be inferred from the harmonious play displayed by such instrumental organs as the eye, the ear, &c., for it cannot be doubted that the organs are merely the instruments which, like all other machinery, require an *agent* to work them up. When, besides, the nature of sounds, colours, tastes, &c. is well admitted to be *cognizable*, the existence of the *cognizing being* is a natural inference. This cognizing being cannot be the body, the organs,\* or the *manas*†, the soul or spiritual body, for

\* By the word ‘organ’ is here meant, the ‘*Indriya*’ or the senses. The ‘*Indriyas*’ are the invisible organisation of the spirit as distinct from the visible organs wherein these spiritual organs or powers reside.

† Man is viewed in Sanscrit philosophy, as a compound of three entities. 1. The gross physical body, called the *sthula sharira*. 2. The spiritual body, here called the *manas*. It is an organisation of life and sensation principles and is a fine imperceptible intermediate connecting link between the gross material body and 3. the internal spirit who is the true man, the central reality that does, feels, enjoys and is conscious. One of the consequences flowing from this organisation of the *manas* is that it is impossible for the spirit to be cognizant of two impressions at the same time.

they are not endowed with consciousness. The body is not endowed with consciousness, because it is the product of composition of dead, inert and altogether unconscious elements and atoms of matter, just as such common objects as the pitcher, &c. are devoid of consciousness. But, further, the body is not the conscious being, because if consciousness were really due to the body, the body would not be unconscious after death ; which is not so. Nor are the organs, the conscious entities ; because, firstly, they are mere instruments, and, secondly, had it been so, their destruction would be always followed by loss of consciousness, and their existence by the manifestation of consciousness, whereas both alternatives are wrong. Even when the eye gets deranged, coloured objects may not be perceived ; but they can be remembered, so that consciousness in the state of after-memory still remains even on the derangement or destruction of an organ. Also, when the organs are all sound, consciousness may not exist when the objects of perception are not presented to the organs. Hence, the organs are not the conscious entities. Nor is the *means*, the spiritual body, the conscious being, for it is an instrument still, and were it not an instrument in the hands of the spirit, it would be possible for the spiritual body to be cognizant at one and the same time of more conscious impressions than one, which is not so. Hence is clearly established the existence of a fourth entity other than the gross body, the organs, and the *manas*, the spiritual body.



The primary inference with respect to the human spirit is that of a *controlling being*. When the driver, by the exertion of his muscular power, turns the reins of the horses that pull the carriage, on one side, or on the other, the carriage obeys the motion, and forthwith rolls on to that side. Now a similar turning of the activities of the body, called *pravritti* and *nivritti*, *i.e.* application to what is deemed pleasurable, and voluntary withdrawal from what is deemed painful, is perceived to take place in our bodies. Our bodies are thus like a carriage; the driver, *Atma*, regulating by the reins he holds, at his will, the *pravritti* and *nivritti* of the body. Our second inference with respect to the human spirit is that of a *blacksmith given constantly to force wind out of the bellows*. The air that enters the lungs gets chemically vitiated, and the *Atma* constantly forces it out blowing it through his bellows, the lungs. Our third inference is from the natural nictitation of the eyelashes. Just as a *juggler makes the puppets move at every pull of the wires*, so the tension of the proper nerves produced by the exertion of *Atma* keeps the eye-lashes executing their movement. Our fourth inference is with respect to the *spirit as an architect*. An architect-master of the house soon builds up an edifice of his house, repairs a gone-down ladder or a worn-up ceiling, and plasters or whitewashes his dirty rooms. So does the architect *Atma* cause the growth of the yet undeveloped body, repairs its wounds and its fractured or injured parts. Our fifth inference with respect to the *Atma* is that of a *child moving with a stick the spider from one corner of the room to the other*.

So does the *Atma* move the spiritual body, with the curiosity of a child, from one corner (organ) of the body to the other. Our sixth inference is that of a *spectator* standing in the centre of a circular hall provided with windows on all sides, who can see undisturbed, from his elevated position, through proper windows, what goes on in each direction. A fruit is presented to the sense of sight. The colour only is seen, but the taste of it is soon remembered, and outflows the saliva from the tongue in the luxuriance of deliciousness. Besides, we infer the existence of a substratum from such attributes as pleasure, pain, desire, hatred, will and knowledge. These attributes do not belong to the body or the organs. For, the ego identifies itself with these attributes but not with the body or the organs. "I feel, I desire," are true interpretations of consciousness, but not that the body or the organs feel, desire or are conscious.

These attributes refer to a substance wherein they inhere, are not to be found in any and every substance, and are not cognizable by the outer senses. Hence they are the attributes of a third something, *Atma*. The attributes of *Atma* are knowledge, feeling of pleasure, feeling of pain, desire, hatred, exertion, morality and immorality, impressibility, number, magnitude, separate existence, connectibility and separability. The first six attributes have been already dealt with. Morality and immorality are attributes of *Atma*, for the human spirit is a responsible agent. The spirit is also impressible, for such impressions alone can be the cause of memory. The ego of each individual being conscious of a different set of enjoyments



from the other, & being unable to present to his consciousness the states & feelings of another individual, it is clear that each human spirit has a distinct entity & is therefore in itself a unit, *i.e.* possesses the attribute of number. As freely circulating itself in the body, it has magnitude. The feelings of pleasure, and pain all rise in the spiritual body, and the spirit is only conscious of them by its contact with the spiritual body and through it with the object of feeling. Hence its attributes of connectibility and separability.

To recapitulate. We have viewed *Atma* from the external or the scientific point of view. We have shown that honest faithful research into the physiology of man and his self-healing powers reveals the presence of a subtle invisible essence, the fountain of all vitality and of all restorative and reconstructive energy. This animating principle has been called the *Atma*, and in the face of the evidence derived from the vital phenomena manifested by such animals as the *Gregarinida* and the like, scientific men of Huxley's stamp have been forced to confess that "life is the cause & not the consequence of organisation." It has further been pointed out how schools of science and metaphysics have been at war with each other and among themselves, unable to explain the simplest phenomena of nature, due to a partial recognition of the potencies of *Atma*. In the end was annexed the translation of a passage of Gautama's *Prashastapada Bhashya*, which is an exhaustive summary of all inferential or external proofs of the existence of *Atma*.

To illustrate the reasonings in the above mentioned passage.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that *Atma* is there viewed as a refined and subtle entity, *imperceptible* by the senses. There exists a prejudice against this view, which it will be well to clear out before proceeding further. The prejudice is to disbelieve all that is *invisible, imperceptible, or uncognizable by the senses.*

This prejudice arises either from too superficial an experience, or from an exclusive devotion to material or physical pursuits and to purely experimental or empirical sciences, where the faculties of observation are constantly in demand, but the faculties of reflection, imagination or abstraction are seldom, if ever, used.

An intimate acquaintance, however, with the phenomena of these very sciences will prove that the true causes of these phenomena, and therefore the true realities, are always hidden, invisible and imperceptible. Take, for instance, the most familiar case of *Gravitation*. Every particle of matter attracts every other particle of matter in the universe, with a *force* in proportion to the product of their masses, and in inverse ratio with the square of their distances. And this *force* the scientific men term *Gravitation*. Observe the infinity of *palpable effects* which the operation of this single law or the working of this single force produces. Every thing, from the smallest atom to the most majestic sun, is under its control. Gravitation is the parent of all phenomena of cosmic motions,—of the movements of planets in their



orbits, of the movement of satellites round the planets, of the change of seasons, of the flight of comets, of the fall of meteors, of tides and ebbs, and of eclipses. And yet, notwithstanding the palpability of its multifarious effects, is Gravitation *itself* palpable, or is it a *subtle, invisible, yet real* force, *existing* in nature, and revealing its presence by the *visible, palpable*, phenomenal effects it produces? Or, to take another example, *electricity*. What is this *all-pervading substance*? No particle of matter is without it. Excitable by friction, or inducible by influence, it dwells within the interior of every material body, hidden and unperceived. When the electric current passes through the telegraph wires in the process of the message being transmitted, it passes un-  
 awares all the way long, leaving no palpable, visible effects on the wires ; but the same invisible, hidden element makes itself felt in the receiving-station by the ringing of the alarum, the sharp clicking movement of the magnet, the motion of the dial, or the jolting of the ink or the pencil. More mysterious still is the working of magnetism. There may lie a huge mass of iron, in the shape of a horse-shoe, surrounded by a long coil of shellac. covered copper wire ; and in its vicinity may lie huge masses of iron, nails, pins, hammers, &c. As yet, the magic of magnetism is not at work. In an instant, the current of a strong battery is sent through the coil, and the inert lifeless piece of horse-shoe becomes alive with a strange energy. It avariciously attracts the nails and the hammer, the pins and every other iron around. There is no *visible, palpable* change in the iron of the

horse-shoe. But, though unperceived, it is now the play-ground of magnetism, which, though so potent in its effects and manifestations, is itself subtle and invisible.

It is clear, then, that the true causes of things are hidden, invisible, and imperceptible by the senses. Their effects, the phenomena produced by them alone, are visible or perceptible. The chief fallacy of reasoning consists, in such cases, in regarding the visible & immediate media of actions as causes ; whereas, true causes are hidden, real and eternal. If the vital phenomena, manifested by living organisms, and, above all, by man, have a *cause* at their basis, that *cause* must, of necessity, be hidden, real and imperceptible by the senses. The subtle, invisible nature of *Atma*, therefore, instead of being an objection against its existence, is, in the true light of things, rather a proof corroborative, an essential consequence of its existence.

Viewed objectively, therefore, *Atma* can only be the subject of *inference*. Now, every inference presupposes two things, the something whose existence is to be inferred and the *certain* data from which such existence is inferred, the ground of inference being some similarity or resemblance. The great problem of inference really lying in determining which similarity or resemblance is to be deemed as sufficient and which as insufficient for the purposes of such inference. The known datum or data, from which the unknown something is inferred are called, in Sanscrit logic, the *linga*, and the something inferred is called the *anumeya*. With reference to this question of inference, says Kashyapa, the logician—



अनुमेयेन सखडं पसिडं च तदनुते ।

तदभावे च नास्त्येव तस्मिन्मनुमापकम् ॥

That alone is a valid datum for inference (*linga*) which has firstly been known to co-exist with the thing to be inferred at some time or place, secondly is also known to be present wherever the like of the thing to be inferred exists, and thirdly to be absent wherever the unlike of the thing to be inferred exists. To take for instance, a concrete example. From the fall of the barometer is inferred the decrease of the pressure of the air. Let us see if such an inference can be valid inference. The fall of the barometer is known, the decrease in the pressure is unknown. But we know from a *specific* experiment (*i.e.* an experiment conducted at a particular time and place), that decrease of pressure produces fall of barometer. This fulfills the first condition. Secondly, similar cases of the decrease of pressure, by whatsoever cause, are attended with the fall of barometer, but the third condition is not fulfilled. It is not true that wherever there is no fall in the barometer, there is no decrease of pressure; for, there may be no fall of barometer, although the pressure may have decreased. The mercury, through rise of temperature, expanded and became lighter. Had the same pressure continued, the column of mercury would have risen higher up, but the fall of pressure compensated for the rise and left the mercury apparently where it was. The three canons of Kashyapa, therefore, conclusively prove that the fall of the barometer is not the *linga* of the decrease of pressure.

Similar reasoning will show that the decrease in the weight of the superincumbent column of mercury is the *linga* of the decrease of pressure.

Having shown, in general, what data are fit to be the ground of inference, it remains to see upon what phenomena can the inference of the existence of *Atma*, be grounded. These phenomena must bear some definite relation to *Atma*, must be *known* to occur in some cases where the essential attributes of *Atma* are found; and there should be no *Atma* where these are not found. These phenomena are of two kinds; firstly, the working and activity of the bodily organs, and secondly, the sensations of which one is cognizant. Hence, it is from these two classes of phenomena that the existence of *Atma* can be objectively inferred. For, consciousness being the characteristic attribute of *Atma*, some activities of bodily organs are not only known to be produced by the will of the conscious *Atma*, but there are other activities that are not produced by will but are invariably observed wherever there is consciousness; and besides, in all cases of living bodies dying, or inanimate objects, the organism or the object is devoid of the performance of those function. And so with respect to sensations.

Before proceeding however, to a detailed enumeration of such phenomena, it will be useful to review a theory that has so often been alleged against the independent existence of *Atma*, and in the minds of some unoriginal students, so constantly throws its obstructive feelers against the clear comprehension of the subject on the part of an honest inquirer. That theory is the mechanical



theory. We shall show, how far the mechanical theory can render an explanation of consciousness.

Leaving apart *Atma*, man consists of three things, *sharira*, *indriya*, and *manas*. *Sharira*, as Gautama defines it in his Nyaya philosophy, चेष्टेन्द्रियार्थाश्रयः शरीरम्

१.११॥ is the solid framework of the body together with the visible organs, that are located in it. It is the groundwork of all activity, the seat of all senses and their sensations. The *indriyas* are the fine subtle entities, distinct from but located in the fine visible organs of sense respectively, by virtue of each of which the *Atma* obtains a distinct and definite consciousness of each of the five sensations, smell, taste, colour, touch and sound. The *indriyas* are, accordingly, the invisible internal media of sensation for the perception of the spirit. That they are independent of the visible organs, is not to be laughed at. For, in many cases, have the *tympanic membrane*, the *hammer* and the *anvil* of the ear have been removed, leaving the stapes alone, without injuring the sense of hearing. And so with other organs. Indeed, the fact of the senses being independent of the visible organs, instead of, in any way, contradicting our experience, is so clearly borne out by human experience that unsophisticated reason never doubts it. For, "during the hours of physical repose, while the parts of the system are recruiting and reproducing new strength and energy, and while the organs of sense are closed to all external impressions, the mind, free from all obtrusive & disturbing influences makes imaginative excursions to different places and contemplates different things in existence. It supposes it,

sees or hears ; while sometimes it is arrested in its travels by the sound of beautiful music, or by various pleasing scenes which it appears to enjoy. Sometimes it supposes it walks, feels, tastes, or suffers excruciating pain. It also appears to be irresistibly in many places where it had no previous desire or intention to be. During all of these peregrinations, the wave of sound, the reflection of light, the susceptibility of feeling, the pleasure of tasting are all supposed to be enjoyed . . .

. . . This proves that there is an *internal medium of sensation* by which the mind enjoys its capacity, as if the, external were in connection with the world. It proves also that there is a medium existing upon these nerves of sensation, *independent both of internal and external exciting causes*.\* This medium of sensation is the *indriya*. And lastly *manas*, the soul, or the mind is a third entity distinct from *Atma*. Says Gautama in his Nyaya philosophy

युगपज्ज्ञानात्पत्तिर्मनसो लिङ्गम् १ । १६ ॥

The existence of *manas*, or mind is established from the fact that one is only capable of attending to one thing at a time. It is said of a Greek philosopher that he was engaged in solving a mathematical problem when an army passed by, and he was altogether unconscious of it, till a soldier effaced the circle the philosopher had drawn on earth, a fact, which alone disturbed the attention of the philosopher. What followed may be left to history. Was the movement of an *army* entirely noiseless? Were no sound waves propagated when the philo-

---

\* Principles of Nature, by Andrew Jackson Davis.



sopher was solving his mathematical problem? Did not the waves enter the cavity of his ear, put to vibration the tympanic membrane, the delicately placed stapes, the grain-filled liquid in the internal labyrinths of the ear, in fact the invisible medium of sensation upon the nerves, the *indriya*? All this did take place, but the philosopher was not *attending* to it. There was in the philosopher a *something* which when engaged in thinking (*i.e.* solving the problem) was not in contact with the internal ear; a *something* whose contact with one *indriya* or faculty precluded its contact simultaneously with another. Its *contact* with an *indriya* and therefore with an organ is what we call *attention*; its separation from this cuts the cords of connection, and the result is what we call *absent-mindedness*. Nor is this *manas* the conscious entity; for, who does not know that all the ideas that our experience has acquired for us lie for the most time in a latent registered state in the brain, or more correctly in the *manas*, but that each and any of them is *remembered* whenever it is *recalled*?

We have seen what *sharira*, *indriya* and *manas* are. We shall now examine whether any one of them is endowed with consciousness. For if, barring *Atma* aside, man consist of three substances, *sharira*, *indriya* and *manas*, and each of them be proved to be unconscious or unfit to evolve consciousness, no doubt would remain as to a fourth substance *Atma* being the conscious entity. Firstly then, the *sharira* is not the conscious entity, for it is the product of the composition of dead, inert and altogether unconscious elements and atoms of matter and

all bodies that are the product of the composition of such particles are themselves dead and inanimate. The whole world of inorganic chemical compounds including watches, steam engines, &c., is an illustration of the principle. Nor are the organic compounds an exception to this laws. So long as organic bodies are associated with a living germ, their manifestations remain every much modified and changed, but when deserted by the enlivening principle, even organic structure fails to show any signs of vitality and consciousness. To be clearer still, suppose the *sharira* to be endowed with consciousness. Let us inquire whether this consciousness be inherent in the *sharira*, or mere accidental to it. If inherent, the *sharira* should be conscious even after death, which is not so. If accidental, the statement amounts to saying that we must seek for some other substance besides the body for consciousness. Nor are the *indriyas*, the conscious entities, for they are mere instruments, requiring an agent to work them up. Besides, their presence is not necessarily attended with consciousness, as in the case of absent-mindedness; nor is their loss accompanied with the loss of consciousness, for even when the eye is deranged or altogether removed from the socket, coloured objects may be remembered in consciousness. Nor is the *manas* the conscious being, for if it were so, it would be directly conscious of every impression, and we should observe no such restriction in practice, as the inability to cognize two impressions at one and the same time.

A little reflection and calm sound reference to one's own consciousness will convince every one of the entire



distinctness of the Ego, *Atma*, from the body, its organs, functions, affections, and even sensations. There are two grand general principles which underlie the whole of the above reasoning. The first is the well-known and much abused principle, *ex-nihilo nihil fit*. It is enunciated thus—

नासतीवियतेभावो नाभावो वियते सतः ।

उभयोरपि दृष्टोन्तस्त्वगयोस्तत्त्वदर्शिभिः ॥\*

What is not, never becomes something, and whatsoever is, is never reduced to nothing. The wise men have fully measured the entire truth of both these assertions. Prejudiced, sophisticated, vicious, ignorant minds cannot easily comprehend this,† This is the cardinal principle of all sound philosophy. Creation is simply impossible. The principles of Nature only reveal *formation*. For, let us for one moment suppose creation to be possible. If possible, let something come out of *nothing*. This very assertion assumes that there is a *nothing* which can produce something. Hence there are two kinds of *nothing* first the *ordinary nothing* from which nothing comes out ; secondly this *peculiar nothing* which gives rise to something. Now whatsoever has many kinds is not nothing but something. Hence nothing, which is of two kinds, is not nothing but something. Or something can only arise out of *something*. The reverse of it is simply inconceivable. The second principle which may be re-

---

\* Bhagavad Gītā II. 16.

† Swāmi Dayānand : Satyārtha Prakāsha, page 222, 3rd Edition.

garded as the corollary of this is thus formulated in Vaisheshika philosophy—

कारणगुणपूर्वकः कार्यगुणो दृष्टः । ‡

The effect only reveals whatsoever pre-existed in the cause. No new attribute can spring up. If these two principles were vividly and constantly kept before the mind one would be quite safe from the attacks of unsound reasoning. But our materialists of modern times who hold the mechanical theory to be sufficient for explaining the phenomena of the universe, are not only content with forgetting these two principles, but openly and broadly contradict these very innate conceptions of the human mind. Says Charles Bradlaugh, "Religionists seem to think that they avoid the difficulty, or turn it upon us, by propounding riddles. They analyze the body and, giving a list of what they call elementary substances, they say: Can oxygen think? Can carbon think? Can nitrogen think? and when they have triumphantly gone through the list, they add, that as none of these by itself can think, thought is not a result of matter but a quality of soul. This reasoning at best only amounts to declaring: "We know what body is, but we know nothing of soul; as we can not understand how body which we do know can think, we therefore declare that it is soul which we do not know that does think." There is a still greater *fault* in this theological reasoning in favor of the soul, for it assumes, contrary to experience, that no quality or result can be found in a given combination

‡ Vaisheshika Sūtras, II. i. 24.



which is not also discoverable in each or any of the modes, parts, atoms, or elements combined. Yet this is *monstrously absurd*. Sugar tastes sweet, but neither carbon, nor oxygen, nor hydrogen, separately tasted, exhibits sweetness; yet sugar is the word by which you describe a certain combination of carbon, oxygen and hydrogen. I contend that the word "soul" in relation to human, vital, and mental phenomena, occupies an analogous position to that which used to be occupied by such words as "demon," "genii," "fairy," "gods," in relation to general physical phenomena".<sup>\*</sup>

Is this sound philosophy? Does Charles Bradlaugh<sup>h</sup> think that if this soul-hypothesis cannot explain the phenomena of consciousness, his material atoms can? Here is his answer.

"The ability to think is never found except as an ability of animal organisation, and the ability is always found higher or lower as the organisation is higher or lower . . . . . The orthodox maintainers of soul . . . . contend that what they call the soul will live when the human being has ceased to live, but they do not explain whether it did live, before the human being began to live."† Here Charles Bradlaugh speaks of the Christians, for the Vedic philosophy verily establishes the eternity, and hence the pre-existence of human spirits. Further on, he says, "The orthodox contend that what they call the elementary substances, taken separately, do not think, therefore man

---

\* Charles Bradlaugh: "Has man a soul?" pp. 4-5.

† Charles Bradlaugh: "Has man a soul." p. 5.

without a soul cannot think, and that as man does think he must have a soul. This argument if valid at all, goes much too far ; a trout thinks, a carp thinks, a rat thinks, a dog thinks, a horse thinks, and, by parity of reasoning, all these animals should have immortal souls†."

And undoubtedly they have ; but timid Christians are afraid of confessing it, and hence the righteous attack of Bradlaugh on orthodox Christians. His arguments, instead of invalidating any of the principles of Vedic philosophy, rather prove it. But to return to the first quotation from Bradlaugh. Evidently we cannot explain how body can think, and so long as the principle, *ex nihilo nihil fit* remains true, and its reverse utterly inconceivable no man shall ever understand how body can think. What then is the irresistible conclusion. Evidently this, that if the existence of consciousness is ever to be explained to the understanding, it should be, not by referring to body or the elements of which it is composed, but to something, to begin with, not body. This something, with respect to which nothing more is predicated than "the cause of thinking that is not body," may be conveniently termed the spirit, or as the English world puts it, the soul. What harm is there then in declaring that *it is the soul* (about which we predicate no more than what has gone before) *that thinks.*" And yet Bradlaugh has to find fault with this. And further, he contradicts the very two principles enumerated above, and says that the assertion, that no quality or result can be formed in a combination that is not discoverable in

---

† Ibid p. 5.



the elements of combination, is monstrously absurd. He adduces the illustration of sugar, and says, the elements of sugar do not taste sweet, but that sugar does. Is not this superficial reasoning? Has no one, in a dream, ever tasted the sensation of sweetness? And yet there is no sugar, no certain combination of carbon, oxygen and hydrogen there. Sweet taste is not in the sugar, (for if it were, no one could ever dream of tasting sweetness), & hence it need not be in the carbon, oxygen and hydrogen of which sugar is composed. It is enveloped in a certain agitation of the proper nerve, and the specific combination of carbon, oxygen and hydrogen, known as sugar, only serves to set free by chemico-electrical energy of dissolution in the saliva of the tongue, a definite quantity of energy, which produces the agitation of the proper nerve, and hence the sensation of sweet taste. In dream, this agitation is produced, not by external means, but by internal ones. The case of sugar is, therefore, a further, illustration of our principle, instead of being a refutation.

But there are materialists wiser than Charles Bradlaugh who instead of denying the two grand generalisations of philosophy above-mentioned, rather take their stand upon them, and bring in the word *latent* to rescue the mechanical theory from its intrinsic inability to explain the fact of consciousness. They fare no better, for, as we shall see, they are the victims of a graver logical fallacy. They reason thus:—It is true that in the act of combination, no new qualities or results are produced but it very often happens that the process of combina-

tion or organisation forces out that which was formerly latent, and makes it manifest. For instance, gunpowder when heated, possesses the power of exploding. The explosive power is already latent in the gunpowder, and the act of firing only renders manifest what was latent. To explain it further. It is well-known that wood or charcoal when heated in the presence of oxygen burns. It is also well-known that friction and percussion develop heat. And it is well-known as well that if a part of space is filled up with a quantity of a gas, more than it can hold at ordinary pressure, it will expand and will propel any body in the way of its expansion. The propulsion of cork from soda-water bottles is a familiar illustration. And lastly, it is well-known too that heat expands gases, and that gases occupy so many hundred times more space than the same substances in the solid condition do. All these are well-known and familiar truths; yet the manufacture of gunpowder is not an obvious invention. Why? Because, we require a definite arrangement of substances and forces to gradually and naturally evolve a desired result. We want explosion. Now explosion means propulsion of shot. Let therefore a gas expand against shot. But whence are we to get a pressed or squeezed quantity of gas to expand? Evidently from a solid that by decomposition might evolve a gas and large quantity of heat. This gas is to be the carbonic acid, the gas of the soda water, and the heat is to come from chemical action. But carbonic acid is the product of carbon and oxygen. Hence the solid mixture must



contain charcoal, the source of carbon, and saltpetre or nitre the source of oxygen. The primeval concussion is to be the source of the fire applied to the charcoal. Hence gunpowder is an ultimate mixture of charcoal, sulphur and nitre. A chemist thus explains its action. "The general decomposition which occurs when gunpowder is fired may be expressed by saying that the oxygen of the nitre combines with the charcoal, forming carbonic acid and carbonic oxide, whilst the nitrogen is liberated, and the sulphur combines with the potassium (of the nitre). Hence gunpowder can burn under water or in a closed space, as it contains the oxygen needed for the combustion in itself; and the great explosive power of the substance is due to the violent evolution of large quantities of gas, and a rapid rise of temperature causing an increase of bulk sudden and great enough to produce what is termed an explosion."

It is thus clear that in the process of combination, only properties that were latent become manifest. Hence it is argued that the specific combination of matter, which we call the organism of men develops or renders manifest the latent consciousness of matter. Hence, there is no conscious spirit. Matter with its infinity of properties is enough to explain all consciousness. Let us weigh this doctrine of latent consciousness carefully. When a pound of ice is taken and a thermometer inserted in it, and the whole heated, a large quantity of heat is absorbed till the whole of ice becomes water. This heat has no effect

---

\* Henry E. Roscoe : Lessons in Elementary Chemistry.

upon the thermometer. Or, if the hand were dipped in ice till the whole of ice were converted into water, the hand will not feel any sensation of warmth. Heat is, in this case, said to become latent in water. This example is enough to show that any quality or property of which there is no consciousness for the time being, but which begins to be felt under proper conditions is said to be latent. Now what is meant when it is said that the latent consciousness of matter becomes manifest? Can there be any latent consciousness? Can any one conceive such a jargon? All properties of substances that are external to us, or are objective but not subjective, may be conceived as existing and not exciting consciousness. But can any one conceive a consciousness that is not consciousness? For, what is *latent consciousness* but a consciousness of which there is no consciousness, or an unconscious consciousness? *Latent consciousness* is no more a reality than a circular square or a not-white white. It is a contradiction in terms. This entire reasoning is based on a real ignorance of the signification of consciousness. It is simply a *hetwabhasa* (pseudo-reasoning) arising out of the metaphorical misuse of the word latent when applied to consciousness.

We will also here mention the physiological theory which is in vogue at present with scientific men and philosophers of the experiential school. This theory is another attempt to reduce consciousness to the terms of matter & motion. It establishes that brain is not only the principal organ of mind, but that the nerve currents generated in the brain are the whole source of the mind w<sup>o</sup>



know. Says a writer, "The brain is highly retentive of the impressions made upon it, they are embodied in its structure and are a part of its growth. They may be reproduced on after occasions, and then what we find is a series of currents and counter-currents, much the same as what existed when the impression was first made. When the mind is in the exercise of its functions, the physical accompaniment is the passing and repassing of innumerable streams of nervous influence. Whether under a sensation of something actual, or under an emotion or a train of ideas, the general operation is still the same. It seems as if we might say, *no currents, no mind.*"\* To it might be added what Herbert Spencer gives in one of his volumes on Synthetic philosophy. After stating how water, nitrogen and carbon establish the easily modifiable nature of the brain he goes to state that the nature of the current is the dislodgment of energy, and that all cerebral action is simply a case of the dislodgment of energy. The brain centres may be compared to wound-up springs. The nerves by their agitation start the first movement of the spring, and the brain centre begins to unwind itself. To show the merits and demerits or the explanatory limit of this hypothesis, let us consider the question, as to how is the consciousness of difference in *degree* and *quality* produced, and how are these two kinds of differences differentiated in pure consciousness. Every one knows what qualitative and quantitative (*i.e.* those belonging to degree) differences are. Two tons of soap differ from five tons of soap in quantity. But glycerine

---

\* Alexander Bain : Senses and the Intellect.

soap differs from carbolic soap in quality. Similarly our sensations, subjective experiences, also present differences of degree and quality as well. The taste of an ounce of sugar dissolved in two tumblers of water differs in *degree* from the taste of the same dissolved in five. But the sensation of taste differs from the sensation of colour in *quality*. The question is, How came man to know that there are any such things as a difference of degree, and a difference of quality? and lastly, How does he distinguish between these two? Here is an account of both on the disengagement theory, which will render its utility very plain.

Whenever molecular energy is disengaged at the conscious centres of the brain, consciousness is the result. Now on this hypothesis, consciousness of differences in degree results from the disengagement of greater or less quantity of molecular energy from the same centres of the brain. Differences of quality, which objectively arise from sensations being transferred from distinct separate extremities or organs through different channels, will be subjectively consciousnessed, on this hypothesis, by the disengagement of molecular energy from different centres of the brain. Thus far, the explanation may proceed without error. But why should disengagement of molecular energy at one centre of the brain produce a consciousness qualitatively different from the consciousness produced by the disengagement of energy at another centre, still remains a problem.

Perhaps some would suggest that the chemical energy disengaged at different centres is disengaged by disintegration of atoms of different elements, or atoms of



different compounds, and hence the different sensations experienced. But even if it be so, the question still remains the same. For, whether it be the energy disengaged by the decomposition of this compound or that, or by the setting free of the elements of this atom or that, the energy disengaged is energy still. And the only difference that we can conceive between the energies disengaged at two different centres of the brain, is the difference of quantity or degree, and not of quality, for energies disengaged are energies still. Hence we should only be conscious of difference of degree, even when molecular energy is dislodged at different centres of the brain, an assertion which is against all experience. We have shown how differences in quality cannot be explained by the theory of disengagement of molecular energy. It is at this stages, that the physiological hypothesis remains at a standstill in reducing consciousness in terms of energy.

We have thus shown how all materialistic explanations fare. It remains now to state the objective inferences regarding *Atma*. The first inference is from the structure of the nervous system with which man is endowed & its connection with muscular movement. The brain consists of collections of a grey matter, called brain-centres, from which proceed fine white silvery threads, called the nerves. Some of these nerves, called the motor nerves, terminate in muscles, which are appropriated for definite motions. The function of the nerves is mainly that of a conducting medium like the telegraph wires. The brain centres originate the influence that is sent through the nerves to

the muscles that obey the influence. This influence is called the nervous current. Thus is the apparatus of movement constructed in the human organism. Suppose, I desire to move my hand. At the command of *will*, the proper brain centre yields forth the nervous current which travelling through the proper nerves produces the contraction of the desired muscle and forthwith moves the hand. This working of the muscular & nervous system proves the existence of a *willing, controlling agent*. A very fit parallel of this is the case of the driver, turning, by the exertion of his muscular power, the reins of the horses that pull the carriage. The driver is the *willing, controlling agent*. The hand of the driver that yields the impetus to the reins is the *proper brain centre* that yields the nervous current to the nerves. The *reins* are the *nerves* and the horse is the *muscular organ* which it is desired to move. The *Atma* is therefore regarded as the *rathi*, the *driver* of the body. This is the first inference.

The second inference is from the action of the lungs. There is in the act of respiration, an inspiration, a holding of the breath within, and an expiration. In the act of inspiration, by the motion of proper membranes, the air of the atmosphere passes within the lungs to oxidize blood, convert carbon into carbonic acid and burn off other impurities. Says Manu—

दहन्तेऽधायमानानां धातूनां हि यथा मलाः ।

तथेन्द्रियाणां दहन्ते दोषाः प्राणस्य निग्रहात् ॥

The goldsmith by blowing strongly against a piece of impure gold removes its impurities by oxidation. So a



proper blowing of the lungs produces the removal of all impurities of the body and the bodily organs by oxidation.

Hence this vitiated, chemically changed air, now laden with carbonic acid and other impurities is further expelled by the act of expiration. This process is continually kept up, and thus by the cyclic movement of expiration and inspiration, the body expels its waste matter, renovates its blood, derives strength & nourishment from the invisible elements of the air, and repairs losses and injuries. This process argues the existence of a blower. To make the interence clearer, let us take the case of a goldsmith or blacksmith blowing with his bellows air into the furnace against a piece of gold or iron ; when the air is forced out of the bellows into the furnace, a certain muscular force has to be exerted. But it requires no exertion on the part of the smith to fill the bellows again with air. So with the lungs. The expiratory function is under the control of the will. But inspiration is a purely involuntary act. Hence it is clear that the structure of the lungs displays the activity of an *agent* that constantly blows the air out.

A similar inference may be drawn from the phenomenal of winking. This function, too, like the lungs, is controllable by will, but even in its ordinary performance it is so exact and regular that it has been aptly compared to the movement of puppets at the hand of a skilled master. Winking may be artificially produced by touching the inner surface of the upper eyelid with anything solid, when the spasmodic flutter produced will most vividly bring out the notion of an interiorly residing hidden mas-

ter, at whose command the flutter is produced, like the dance of the puppet, in the effort to remove any such foreign material.

The physiological phenomena of recuperation and growth are above all most suggestive. The spirit, in the process of the growth of the organism, builds up by its interior anatomy all parts of the body proportionately, repairs the injured parts, heals the wounds, and more remarkable still puts forth an intrinsic effort to shake off all disease and disturbance. This power of the spirit as an architect is well known and has given rise to such terms as the "conservative" powers or "economy" of the human organism. A true appreciation of this fact has also given rise to a noble school of physicians who regard the human organism as a self-healing institution, the medicines occasionally given under this treatment being meant to assist nature and not to counteract disease. Concerning this physiological power and other allied functions of the human spirit, says a medical authority, "By Materialists it is said that digestion is caused by the action of a certain organic matter called *pepsin* in conjunction with several free acids, called lactic, ascetic, chlorohydric. While the truth is, especially in mankind, the peristaltic movement in the alimentary channel like the motion of the innumerable glands in the mucous membrane, and therefore digestion itself is caused independently of the many wondrous cerebro-spinal centres, by the *soul-principle* acting through the filaments of the sympathetic system which is the residence and fulcrum of the automatic instincts and especially of those *vital self intelligent* princi-



ples which flow from the ethers and essences in the constitution of nature into similar substances in the spiritual organisation of man. Hunger, therefore, is a universal voice of the soul in behalf of itself and the dependent body; and digestion is an appropriation by the soul of what soever is supplied for the upbuilding of both itself and body.

Lastly, the complicated relations into which the passive organs of sense enter with the active vital organs, offer a most strong ground of inferenco for the existence of *Atma*. The colour or the smell of an object soon recal. its taste, and the idea of its taste immediately stimulate the tongue to secrete large quantities of saliva, as if in readiness to eat the substance. It is in fact by this very process that large quantities of saliva are obtained for experimental purposes from the tongues of dogs by presenting to their sight delicious dishes of the fleshy food, without actually allowing the dogs, at least for the time being, to partake of it. Such indeed is the complicated relationship of the functions of the organs of sense and of the vital organs, that serious diseases may be started up or caused by the associations thus started up by a single perception. All these facts lead to the inference of a central conscious being here called *Atma*.

---

## THE REALITIES OF INNER LIFE.

---

GENTLEMEN

THE fact that man lives on a double plane of existence, that he leads a two-fold life, is not new in any sense. He lives the life of the *flesh* and the life of the *spirit*. Scientific minds term the one *objective* and the other *subjective* existence. True poets of nature and religious men agree alike in this. "O man! the brute and the angel are alike in thee." The metaphysicians of older Sanscrit schools styled these two modes of existence, the life of Bahishkarana and the life of Antahkarana, the *outer* life of the *Senses* and the *inner* life of the *Intellect*. But the law of double existence is not applicable to it alone. It is a universal law. It applies to the universe. Matter is the entity of the Outer life, and God the reality of the Inner life. And the Trinity of God, matter and contemplating Spirits exhausts the substances of the *Casmos*. Thus the universe lives a two-fold existence, the outer, the *phenomenal* and the inner, the *noumenal*.

The outer plane of existence is the one that is familiar to all. But the inner, the internal, is a blank page, a white sheet to many. The inner, in so far as inner, is poetry; the outer, as the external, is prose. And poetry is to many nothing but wild fantastic imagination let loose. Hence it is that matter, with the ephemeral host of its countless attributes, is the only true God to many.

"Earth's powers and principalities exclude most men from the society of poetry and eternal principles. Matter



is a powerful and controlling God ; it is the prince of darkness " to millions of our throbbing humanity. Matter clings and clusters heavily about man's interior life ; it is the dead freight of his perilous voyage from the cradle to the *crematory*. Men are necessitated to worship at the shrine of matter. They make it the chief object both of masterly effort and spiritual contemplation. Thousands reverence matter incessantly. They bow down before its altars. They bring to it many offerings covering—its temples with every thing within the power of man to bestow, with scientific art, and the works of genius, with developments of the noblest talents, with everything, even life itself.

Mammon is but the servant of matter ; matter is but the servant of soul ; soul is but the servant of spirit ; but in this world, it happens that spirit and soul and matter are the servants of Mammon. No human soul is independent of its material surroundings. All life is real bondage to matter. Matter is the mind's jailor. Want is the overseer who lashes the prisoner into his daily labour.

'Tis the mandate of matter which the mind obeys nine-tenths of earthy time. The sight of objects, the taste of flowers, the smell of odors, the cognition of sensations the hearing of sounds—thus the spirit looks out and lives through the *grated windows* of its prison-castle.

How, then, can man, thus immersed in the life of the senses, realize the interior realities of inner life ? The death of matter is the birth of the soul. Light and darkness can not co-exist.

अन्यदेवाहुः सम्भवादन्वदाहुरसम्भवात् ।

इति शुश्रुम धीराणां ये नस्तद् व्यवचिरे ॥

Thus runs the tenth Mantra of the 40th Adhyaya of the Yajur Veda.

The life of senses (avidya) produces one result, and the life of spirit (vidya) produces exactly the reverse.

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययामृतमश्नुते

"The life of the senses is spiritual death, the life of the spirit is the *new birth*, immortality."

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखं ।

तत्त्वं पूषणपात्रेण सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥

"The resplendent face of truth is hid beyond the veil of the glitter of Mammon :"

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण अपिहितं

"O Preserver of the universe ! remove the veil so that we might see the immortal truth."

Yes, the veil must be removed, the brute in man crushed, before the influx of the Divine Light can be realized.

"The universe with its beauties and laws & harmonies, is *nothing* to the idiot mind caged in matter. The forgeous heavens with their unnumbered systems of suns and stars are *nothing* to a soul bowed down by the daily drag of material necessities. The ponderous globes of space, so attractive to the uplifted mind of the philosopher, are *nothing* to him who makes a God of gain. Matter and money surround him on either side. He driver



through his surronndings, and then they drive through him ; and so goes his daily life "to the last syllable of recorded time."

The fair sky of heavenly truth never covers the earthly mind. Faith in such circumstances is impossible. Doubt, yes doubt, is the only parmout functionary that lives & flourishes. And what else is possible under such circumstances? In such a state, the mind seeks, in vain, for a soul-consoling philosophy. The world of matter, the region of discord alone, is visible. The Omniscient Intelligence of the far off immensities of the universe is nowhere to be found. The whisperings of the regnant functionary, Doubt, are too positive. "Has it not been said that by searching none can find out God?" And is it not true that the most strenuous god-believers confess that it is only a belief with them ; that they really know nothing on the subject?" These are the whisperings of Doubt. But this prime minister of the life of senses, this sceptical functionary does not end his researches here. He is thorough-going. He enters the material world, asks the sciences whether they can disclose the mystery. And this is the summary result of his investigations.

"Geology speaks of the structure of the earth, the formation of the different strata, of coal, of granite, of the whole mineral kingdom. It reveals the remains and traces of animals long extinct, but gives us no clue whereby we may prove the existence of a God."

"Natural History gives us a knowledge of the animal kingdom in general, the different organisms, structures

and powers of the various species. Physiology teaches the nature of man, the laws that govern his being, the functions of the vital organs and the conditions upon which alone health and life depend. Phrenology treats of the laws of the mind, the different portions of the brain, the temperaments, the organs, how to develop some and repress others to produce a well-balanced healthy condition. But in the whole animal economy, though the brain is considered to be a 'microcosm' in which may be traced a resemblance or relationship with everything in nature, not a spot can be found to indicate the existence of a God."

"Mathematics lays the foundation of all the exact sciences. It teaches the art of combining numbers, of calculating and measuring distances, how to solve the problems to weigh mountains, to fathom the depths of the ocean ; but gives us no directions how to ascertain the existence of a God."

"Enter Nature's great laboratory—Chemistry, she will speak to you of the various elements, their combinations, and uses, of the gases constantly evolving and combining in different proportions, producing all the varied objects, the interesting and important phenomena we behold. She proves the indestructibility of matter, and its inherent property—motion ; but in all her operations no demonstrable fact can be obtained to indicate the existence of a God."

"Astronomy tells us of the wonders of the solar system—the eternally revolving planets, the rapidity & certainty of their motions, the distance from planet to planet, from



star to star. It predicts with astonishing & marvellous precision the phenomenon of eclipses, the visibility on our earth of comets, and proves the immutable law of gravitation, but is entirely silent on the existence of a God."

"In fine, descend into the bowels of the earth, and you will learn what it contains ; into the depths of the ocean, and you will find the inhabitants of the great deep ; but neither in the earth above, nor in the waters below, can you obtain any knowledge of his existence. Ascend into the heavens, and enter the milky way, go from planet to planet to the remotest star, and ask the eternally revolving systems, Where is God ? and echo answers—Where ?

"The universe of matter gives no record of his existence. Where next shall we search ? The universe of mind ? Read the millions of volumes written on the subject, and all the speculations, the assertions, the assumptions, the theories and the creeds, man has only stamped the indelible impress of his mind on every page. Human records are, at the best, delineations of human character, of phases of human mind, picture of human existence, but where is God ?"

"Look around you, confess that there is no evidence of intelligence, of design, and consequently of a designer ? What is intelligence ? It is not a thing, a substance, an existence in itself, but simply a property of matter, manifesting itself through organisations."

These, then, are the fond insinuations of doubt, the whisperings of Scepticism, and the legitimate consequences of a life of the senses, an existence in matter, a worship of Mammon, a belief in omnipotent atoms.

For, how can God be thus known: Geology, Natural History, Physiology, Anatomy, Phrenology, Mathematics, Chemistry, Astronomy and all are but groser developments, the outer kernel. They deal only with the tangible, the tactual, the optical, the edible, the olfactory & the palatal. But God, the universal spirit of nature,—*sarvanītar atma*,—is beyond the sensible is far beyond the transient, mobile, vibratory phenomena of the senses.\* Do you descend into the earth, and ascend into the heavens, and explore the regions of immensity to discover the locality of the Universal Spirit?

He is remoter than the remotest, as the physical senses discern him not, He is nearer than the nearest, for, He is the innermost, but foreign or exotic to all that is external.

The law of God's revelations into the soul is the inner harmony. The whirlwind of matter obstructs the adjustment of the internal. Abstraction, meditation, mental quiet and contemplation alone are compatible with the realization of the Divine.

But when he who makes boast of his high impregnability, is himself most vulnerable; he who prides himself upon his valor, is himself most cowardly; he who preaches truth to others, is himself most untruthful, he who sets himself up as the leader of a legion, is himself misled; he who styles himself an honest citizen is unjustly living upon heavy profits filched from the daily toil of hopeless men; how he claims to belong to an honorable profession

---

\* नैनद्देवा आप्नुवन् तद्वावतोऽन्यानत्येति



God, its discovery and appropriation, the true birth of the spirit and the immortality of the soul. Decidedly then I give preference to the invisible over the visible.

"That my meaning may be more distinctly comprehended, let it be observed that the body is a form, is transient, is changeable, the internal *not* changeable. The man is the internal, the effect or form is external. The mind is not acted upon, but acts on the body. That which is internal is the reality ; that which it acts on is visible and mortal. And all appearances foreign are composed of the same mortal ingredients, mortal in the restricted sense of that term.

Now it being clear that the visible is not the real, but that the invisible is the eternal, it follows that we must make the test of truth to consist in an imperceptible, yet unchangeable and eternal principle. Admitting this much, you are able to advance one step further in the cognizance of possible probabilities. Effects are witnessed, they are traced to an immediate cause, which is demonstrated by strict and severe analysis. This cause producing this effect shows you that the effect is not without a cause. This effect produces another and that also another ; and so by analogy you may see there is an endless and incalculable amount of causes and effects. And tracing causes to effects and effects to causes, is the correct process of reasoning, and this you do in your imagination until you arrive at a chaos of existence, then stop breathless and return to ask, What was the cause of the first cause? You would not have gone upon these trackless peregrinations, if you had but considered all forms and

externals as not causes but effects. Let us illustrate this by an example.

Conceive of a germ being hidden beneath the surface of this hard earth. Imagine that you forget its existence. Let a few years of time elapse, and cast your eyes to the spot where it was concealed, and you see a lofty and beautiful tree, standing in all the majesty and dignity of its nature. Would it not be as absurd and impossible to disbelieve the *existence* as it would be to doubt for one moment, the germ which has produced this existence? The tree stands and is visible as an ultimate man stands and is also an ultimate. The germ of the tree, you knew of its existence, but the germ of the world, you do not know of its existence. But is it not evident that the latter is at least *possible* since the first is known and demonstrated? By even assenting to such a possibility, we become prepared to take one more careful step in this investigation.

Let us illustrate the next step to be taken by another example. Suppose a man diseased, physicians examine his case, guided both by physiological manifestations of the disease, and by the feelings which the disease produces, which are not perceptible to them by any processes of external observation. The patient communicates his own feelings, the physicians taking them for granted, and from these together with the symptoms manifest, they decide upon the name of the disease. Each of these physicians, from the evidence which he has received through the senses, differs from the others as to the characters of the disease: Have you not here proof that the external



and manifest is the effect and cannot be relied on, while the cause is hidden; and you do not possess any means by which to investigate its cause?

Again, a man has a carious tooth; he tells you he experiences a severe pain; but you doubt his word & ask for proof. He points you to the tooth which is the object tangible. But does the evidence, of which your senses admit, convince you that he has a pain?

Another example. The whole world of mankind can give in their united testimonies that they positively and absolutely see the sun rising in the east and setting in the west. Is there not internal evidence that the external and manifest of this is positively unreal? Inward searching after truth has established the cause of this phenomenon and proved that the sun does not move. But it is the visible and the external that you are deceived by, and not the invisible which is the reality.

Hence the true student of nature contemplates the invisible in the visible and back of nature, silently contemplates the cause which produced this theatre of human existence, and with highest reverence for truths pertaining thereunto associates with the first Principle of life & activity. His aspirations are purely of an intellectual or moral character. The universe is full of the Lord, and there is nothing of the universe that is not of the Lord:

**ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किञ्चिज्जगत्यां जगत्**

To his purified understanding, freed from passion and dislike, devotion and meditation, confidence and dispassion open the way where the beams of wisdom softly

enter and shed a mellow, agreeable lustre on his feelings and intellect. He has discovered the true saviour, the invisible master, in whom the universe has its being. To him the interior is the real. His expanded intellect passes through the dress to that which is essential, to the spirit within the body, to the life within the law, to the science within the substance.

The conclusion from the above is that it is the expanded intellect, and not prayer, that can lift the soul to the realisation of the divine reality, that the most earnest prayer we can ever utter, is the righteous exertion to merit the inspirations of that flow into the intellect from the Fountain head of all Wisdom.

It has been my object in the present imperfect hasty sketch of my ideas presented to you to establish and make plain three conclusions :

1.—That there is a true inner life, and that a man subjected to the interference of the commotions of the world cannot fully perceive & comprehend the Universal Truth.

2.—That from inability to perceive this Universal Truth by the expanded intellect or purified reason have sprung up the patent theological remedies of prayer-doses and tearful brain-reliefs

3.—That the Original Organiser of the Universe is the Invisible, the Potent, the Universal, and the All-governing Reality of the inner world.



# CRITICISM

## ON

### Monier Williams, 'Indian Wisdom..

—o—

We have mentioned the Preface,<sup>o</sup> the Introduction, and the review of the Vedas. We now come to the Brahmanas and the Upanishads. The very ancient theological and religious records also find a place here. They occupy 21 pages. Then come the Six Schools of philosophy,—the Niyaya, the Sankhya, the Vaisheshika, the Yoga, the Purva Mimansa and the Vedanta schools. This chapter runs through 78 pages. Then we come to Jainism and Bhagawat Gita. Bhagawat Gita has been with great truth styled, the eclectic school of philosophy, and why not so, the Sankhya Marga, the Yoga Marga & the Bhakti Marga, the three royal roads to salvation are equally recognised. This occupies 28 pages: We come now to the Vedangas,—Siksha, Vyakarana, Nirukta, Chhanda and Jyotish,—alphabet, grammar, etymology, prosody and astronomy. This occupies 40 pages. Then come the Smritis; they occupy 114 pages. Manu Smriti and Yajnavalkya are thoroughly reviewed. The author is at home here. He is well pleased to find matters of condemnation in Manu and Yajnavalkya. We come then to Ramayana and Mahabharata. Bulky as these books are a bulk of 140 pages of the book is devoted to these epic poems. The later dramas, puranas, &c. only deserve a

---

\* The Manuscript about of 3 pages is missing except those last few words, consisting of the author's remarks aptly interspersed with long quotations and translations from other authors.

passing notice. They occupy 70 pages. The following is the summary:—

Preface and Introduction	...	PAGES	48
Vedas	...	"	26
Brahmanas and Upanishads	...	"	21
Six Schools of Philosophy	...	"	78
Jainism and Eclecticism	...	"	22
Rhetoric, Grammar and Astronomy	...	"	40
Smritis	...	"	114
Epics (Ramayana and Mahabharata)	...	"	140
Puranas and Dramas	...	"	70
Alphabetic Index	...	"	23

TOTAL ... 588 .

It is evident then that the author is obviously a man of vast study, of wide information, and possessed of encyclopedic knowledge, at least in so far as Sanskrit goes. It is well for us to avail of the information that can be derived from such a source, as such chances are not often to be found, they are exceptional and very rare. The more we proceed with the review of the book the more impatient we become to learn the scope and the contents of the book. This information I shall now no longer withhold from you. I proceed directly to the scope, the aims and objects of the book.

Says Professor Monier Williams, p. 3 of the Preface:—

"The present volume attempts to supply a want, the existence of which has been impressed upon my mind by an inquiry often addressed to me as a Baden Professor:—Is it possible to obtain from any one book a good general idea of the character and contents of Sanskrit literature?"

Further on he says:—

"Its pages are also intended to subserve a further



object. They aim at imparting to educated Englishmen by means of translations and explanations of portions of the sacred and philosophical literature of India; an insight into the mind, habits of thought, and customs of the Hindus as well as a *correct* knowledge of a system of belief and practice which has constantly prevailed for at least 3,000 years, and still continues to exist as one of the principal religions of the non-Christian world.

Then on page 36 of the Introduction, we have:—

"It is one of the following pages to indicate the points of contact between Christianity and the three chief *false* religions of the world, as they are represented in India."  
—(Please mark the word *false*).

Then on page 38 of the Introduction, we have:—

"It seems to me, then, that in comparing together these four systems—Christianity, Islam, Brahminism and Buddhism—the crucial test of the possession of that absolute divine truth which can belong to only one of the four, and which—if supernaturally communicated by the common Father of mankind for the good of all His creatures—must be intended to prevail everywhere, ought to lie in the answer to two questions: 1st What is the ultimate object at which each aims? 2ndly. By what means and by what agency is this aim to be accomplished?"

It is clear then the objects of the Book are:—

I In one book to give a general idea of the character and contents of Sanskrit literature.

II To draw for Englishmen a picture of our manners, habits, customs, institutions, and beliefs, not a distorted,

picture, a misrepresentation, but a true one, for the picture is to be drawn by means of translations and explanations of portions of our sacred literature!!

III. To indicate the points of community between Christian and other non-Christian religions.

IV That Islam, Buddhism and *Brahminism* (mark the last) are the three false religions of the world—or that Christianity is the only true religion.

V That taking Christianity, Brahminism, Islam and Buddhism, the possession of absolute divine truth can only belong to one of the four.

VI That the absolute divine truth as supernaturally communicated by the common Father of mankind (remember this truth is Christianity) is one that is intended to prevail everywhere.

VII. That firstly this absolute truth is the only religion that gives a correct answer to the question, What is the ultimate object or aim? And secondly that this absolute truth or Christianity alone gives the true scheme by which the common end or object of all is to be accomplished.

How far the last four articles of Professor Monier William's claims are right will just appear in the sequel.

A brief sketch of the answer to the first article has already been given in an enumeration of the contents of the book. Let me only point out that the four books, esteemed only next to the Vedas, and generally called the Upa-Vedas, find no mention anywhere throughout the



list. It is especially upon the subject matter of these books that a true estimate of Indian & occidental civilization can be formed by comparison. These four books are the Artha Veda, the Dhanur Veda, the Ayur Veda and the Gandharva Veda. The Artha Veda is the Upa-Veda that deals with applied Mechanics, Engineering, Perspection, Practical Arts (chemical and physical) and geneology. The Ayur Veda is the Upa-Veda that deals with Surgery, Botany, Physiological Chemistry, Anatomy, Physiology, Materia Medica and the Chemistry and cure of poison. The Gandharva Veda is the Upa-Veda of Music or fine arts whereas the Dhanur Veda is the science of Martial appliances, instruments and tactics.

The second article, important as it is, will only be estimated at its due worth, in the progress of their review. In the course of these lectures it will be shown how far Professor Williams misrepresents or otherwise, or rightly translates or mistranslates, gives genuine explanations or forged ones of the portions of our sacred literature.

The third article shall be reviewed fully at the end of the whole course of these reviews.

We come now to the subject matter of the Introduction.

It deals with four points. Firstly, it gives a sketch of the past and present condition. The main portion consists of a geographical, political and historical sketch of the past condition of India as *imagined* by the so-called historians and philologists to be true. All this is foreign to the purpose of my review. One point, however, is worth pointing out. It is where he gives his own remarks on caste system.

This is what he says (p. 24 of Introduction) :—

“Even in districts where the Hind us are called by one name and speak one dialect they are boken into separate classes divided from each other by barriers of caste far more difficult to pass than social distinctions of Europe,” &c., &c. “This separation constitutes, in point of fact, an essential doctrine of their religion. The growth of the Indian caste system is perhaps the most remarkable feature in the history of this extraordinary people. Caste as a social institution, meaning thereby, conventional rules which separate the grades of society, exists of course in all countries. In England, caste in this sense exerts no slight authority. But with us caste is not a religious institution.

On the contrary, our religion, though it permits differences of rank, teaches us that such differences are to be laid aside in the worship of God, and that in His sight all men are equal. Very different is the caste of the Hindus. The Hindu believes that the Deity regards men as *unequal*, that he created distinct kinds of men as he created varieties of birds or beasts, that Brahmanas, Kshatriyas Vaishyas and Shudras are *born* and must remain distinct from each other ; and that to force any Hindu to break the rules of caste is to force him to sin against God and against nature.”

Professor Monier Williams then points out that caste rules in India hinge upon 1. Preparation of food, 2. Intermarriage, 3. Professional pursuits. Had the Boden Professor professed to base these remarks upon personal observations or accounts of India as given by various



writers on the subject, we would have nothing to add but the Baden Professor regards the sacred Sanskrit literature to be the only key to "the satisfactory knowledge of the people committed to our (he means his or his nation's) rule. He says—

"Happily India, though it has at least twenty distinct dialects, has but *one* sacred and learned language and one literature, *accepted and revered* by all adherents of Hinduism alike, however diverse in race, dialect rank and creed."

And it is upon the sacred Sanskrit literature of India that he bases his remarks. Let us see how far they are correct. The Professor asserts :—

I. That caste system in India is a religious institution whereas it is only a social institution in England. It is good for our brothers to note down the confession that there is caste system in England.

II. That according to Christianity, all people are *a like* to God; but in Brahminism the Deity regards men as *unequal*, or

III. That Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vishyas are born, and

IV. That only people of the same caste eat together, intermarry and pursue the same professional pursuits; these three being the tests of caste.

With regard to the second point, that according to the doctrines of Brahminism God regards men as *unequal* I quote the 2nd Mantra of 6th Adhyaya of Yajur Veda.—

यथेमां वाचं कल्याणीमावदानि जनेभ्यः ब्रह्म-  
 राजन्यभ्यां शूद्राय चार्याय च स्वाय चारणाय च ।  
 प्रियो देवानां दक्षिणायै दातुरिह भूयासमयं मे  
 कामः समृद्धतामुजमादो नमतु ॥

The meaning of which is that "I (God) have given my word (Revelation), which is the word of salvation for all people, Brahmanas, Kshatryas, Vaishyas, Shudras, and even Ati Shudras. Therefore regard no one as unequal among yourselves, but try to be loved by all wise people to distribute gifts among all, and always desire the well-being of all."

The Mantra is very clear, and I have quoted it to show that the first position assumed by the Boden Profess or is groundless. We come now to his assertion that caste is a religious Institution and not a social one in India. Now an institution is called a religious one when distinctions of the Institution are maintained on the ground that they are obligatory by religion, but all distinctions maintained on the ground of differences of wealth, learning and industry are social distinctions.

Let us read Manu.

विप्राणां ज्ञानतो जगैष्ठं क्षत्रियाणान्तु वीर्यतः ।  
 वैश्यानां धन्यधान्यतः शूद्राणामेव जन्मतः ॥

The meaning of which is that the ground of distinction among Brahmanas is from the point of learning, that



among Kshatriyas is on account of physical powers and that among Vaishyas is on the ground of wealth and Possessions, that among Shudras alone does birth distinction exist. Lest Monier Williams may mistake my sense and the sense of Manu, and assert on the face of of these quotations that Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas are born, let me again quote Manu—

शूद्रो ब्राह्मणतामेति ब्राह्मणश्चैति शूद्रताम् ।

क्षत्रियाज्जातमेव न्यु विद्याद्वै श्यात्तथैव च ॥

Which means that Shudras can become Brahmanas and Brahmanas Shudras and so with Kshatriyas and Vaishyas.

Again Says Manu—

जन्मनः जायते शूद्रः संस्काराद्भवेद्भिजः ।

That all people are born Shudras, but by *sanscar* or by virtue of *gun akarma swabhava* of their acquisitions and accomplishments, become Brahmanas, Kshatriyas &c.

The fourth position taken up by Monier Williams is that eating together, intermarriage and similarity of pursuits define a caste. Among these three, the second only deserves consideration, For, if similarity of pursuits be any element, it might be as reasonable for Monier Williams to regard all Professors of Schools and Colleges in England to belong to one caste. The same remark applies to food and drinks. Eating and drinking together is absolutely prohibited in Manu not only for people of different castes, but all individuals alike.

नोच्छिष्टः कस्यचिद्दद्यान् नाद्याञ्चैव तथान्तरा ।

न चैवात्यशनं कुर्यान्नाच्छिष्टः कुचिद्व्रजेत् ॥ १ ॥

Says Manu :—

Let no one eat from the same dish with any one else, let none overfeed himself and walk out after dinner with out a hand-wash.

This point therefore is entirely out of question. What now remains is the question of intermarriages. We will here again quote from Manu :—

सवर्णाग्रे द्विजातीनां प्रशस्ता दारकर्मणि ।

कामतस्तु प्रवृत्तानामिमाः स्युः क्रमशो वराः ॥ ५ ॥

शूद्रैव भार्या शूद्रस्य सा च स्वा विशः स्मृते ।

ते च स्वा चैव राज्ञश्च ताश्च स्वा चाग्रजन्मनः ॥ १३ ॥

The meaning of which is that the best form of first marriage is that in which the male and female are of the same *varna* or what is wrongly called caste, but a Shudra, woman should only marry a Shudra, a Vaishya woman a Vaishya. The Kshatriya should marry a शूद्रा, वैश्या, क्षत्रिया and the Brahmana any.

This shows that a *Vaishyans* or Vaishya woman marrying a Brahmana is allowable and so for others. Professor Monier Williams asserted that caste system in India is a religious institution, but it is a social one in England. We have proved that caste system is not a religious institution but a social one as it is everywhere. He assert



ed that in Brahminic religion Deity regards all men as unequal, but we have proved that He does not. He asserted that Brahmanas, Kshatriyas and Vashyas are born. We have proved that they are not but Shudras are. And lastly he asserted that similarity of professions intermarriage and eating together are the characteristics of a caste. We have shown that they are not. We now leave this point which is peculiarly illustrative of the unrivalled learning of the Professor and come to his second part of the Introduction on the religion of the Hindus.

He says that there are 3 points of view from which any religion may be looked ; 1. faith, 2. work or ritual, 3. doctrines or dogmatic knowledge. He calls the 1st two, faith and work or ritual, the exoteric side of religion ; and doctrines or dogmatic knowledge, the esoteric side of religion. After laying down this distinction, he says that viewed from an esoteric point of view, the Hindu religion is Pantheism. He says :—

“It (Hindu religion) teaches that nothing really exists but the Universal Spirit, that the soul of each individual is identical with that spirit, and that every man's highest aim should be to get rid for ever of doing, having and being, and devote himself to profound contemplation with a view to obtain such spiritual knowledge as should deliver him from the mere illusion of separate existence and force upon him the conviction that he is himself part of the one being constituting the universe.”

We shall see how far our Boden Professor of Sanskrit is right in these assertions. He says that Hindu religion teaches :—

- I. That nothing but the Universal Spirit exists.
- II. That each individual is identical with this Spirit.
- III. That every man's aim should be to get rid of all action, doing, having and being.
- IV. That each one should free himself from being in this separate existence,
- V. That each one soul is part of the being constituting the universe.

Let us now examine these five propositions.

His first proposition is that nothing but the Universal Spirit exists. I quote here from an Upanishat :—

अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णां

वह्नीः प्रजाः सृजमानां स्वरूपाः ।

अजो ह्येको जुषमानो ऽ नृशेते

जहात्येनां भुक्तभोगामजो ऽ न्यः ॥

The meaning is that God, matter and human souls, these are the three eternal substances, ever uncreated. The eternal human souls enjoy the eternal matter while involved in material existence. Whereas the third eternal substance, God, exists forever, but neither is involved in material existences, nor enjoys the material world. Here it is said that not one universal spirit alone exists, but matter and human souls also exist co-eternally.



If evidences were required on this head, it would be easy to quote many other very clear passages, but I believe that above is clear enough.

Williams' second proposition is that each is identical with the Universal Spirit. Here let me quote from the Brihadarannyaka Upanishat :—

य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो-

ऽयमात्मा न वेद यस्यःत्मा शरीरम् ।

आत्मा नोऽन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्त र्यान्यमृतः॥

Says Yajnavalkya to Maitreyi in answer to her question, O Maitreyi the Universal Spirit who pervades even the human soul, but is distinct from the human soul, whom ignorant human soul does not know, who resides in the innermost of the human soul, who is distinct from human soul but witnesses the actions of the human soul, and awards or punishes him, yes, even He the Universal Spirit is immortal and also pervades thee.

Williams' third proposition respecting Brahmanical religion is that it teaches every man the duty of getting rid of all doing, being and having.

I quote here from the 40th chapter of the Yajur Veda—

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं पुंसमाः ।

एवं त्वयि नान्यथेती ऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरं ॥

The meaning of which is that each soul should desire to live for 100 years or more, spending his life in doing

actions, always performing good deeds. Thus alone and not otherwise is freedom from sin and pain possible. The purport is that the doing of action or good is the first essential.

Williams' fourth proposition is that each should free himself from the delusion of separate existence. I need not answer this, as it is clear that believing God to be distinct from the soul, the idea of separate existence is not a delusion, and if this be not a delusion, it is not a proper object to get rid of.

The fifth assertion that each soul is a part of the being constituting the universe. If anything need be said upon this head, it will suffice to say that not in one Mantra but in innumerable Mantras and Upanishads, the Universal Spirit is regarded as one whole without form, body or parts, *akhand* or indivisible. Since God has no parts, it is mere absurd to believe that human souls can be parts of of the Universal Spirit that is incapable of being divided into parts.

Then in order to reconcile this pantheistic view which does not admit of any necessity of faith, work or ritual, with the existence of faiths, innumerable works or rituals in India, Williams forges a fallacious reasoning which is called in Sanskrit logic by the technical name of *chhal*. He says that believing God to be identical with human souls they were led to believe that human souls had only emanated from God. English language and English brain may perhaps be capable of confounding identity with



emanation, but unless a clear proof of it is given, I am not in a position to say anything respecting the justification of Williams' position.

I now come to the 3rd part of the Introduction, *i. e.*, the one respecting the Languages of India.

Says Monier Williams—

“The name Sanskrit as applied to the ancient language of the Hindus is an artificial designation for a *highly elaborated form* of the language originally brought by this Indian branch of the great Aryan race into India. The original tongue soon became modified by contact with the dialects of the aboriginal races who preceded the Aryans, and in this way converted into the peculiar language (*bhasha*) of the Aryan immigrants who settled in the neighbourhood of the seven rivers of the Punjab and its outlying districts (*Sapta Sindhavas*—in Zend *Hapta Hendu*). The most suitable name for the original language thus molded into the speech of the Hindus is Hindi-i (= Sindu-i, its principal later development being called Hindi,\* just as the Low German dialect of the Angles and Saxons when modified in Britain was called

---

\* It may be thought by some that this dialect was nearly identical with the language of the Vedic hymns, and the latter often gives genuine Prakrita forms (as *Kuta* for *Krita*) ; but even Vedic Sanscrit presents great elaboration scarcely compatible with the notion of its being a simple original dialect (for example, in the use of complicated grammatical forms like Intensives), and Panini, in distinguishing between the common language and the Vedic, uses the term *Bhasha* in contradistinction to *Chhandas* the Veda.)

Anglo-Saxon. But very soon that happened in India which has come to pass in all civilized countries. The spoken language, when once its general form and character had been settled, separated into two lines, the one elaborated by the learned, the other popularized and variously provincialized by the unlearned. In India, however, from the greater exclusiveness of the educated few, the greater ignorance of the masses, and the desire of a proud priesthood to keep the key of knowledge in their own possession, this separation became more marked, more diversified, and progressively intensified. Hence the very grammar which with other nations was regarded only as a means to an end, came to be treated by Indian Pandits as the end itself, and was subtilized into an intricate science, fenced around by a bristling barrier of technicalities. The language, too, elaborated *pari passu* with the grammar, rejected the natural name of Hindu. <sup>i</sup> or 'the speech of the Hindus,' and adopted an artificial designation, *viz.* *Sanskrita*, the perfectly constructed speech' (*sam*=*con*, *krita*=*factus*, 'formed'), to denote its complete severance from vulgar purposes, and its exclusive dedication to religion and literature; while the name *Prakrita*—which may mean 'the original,' as well as 'the derived' speech—was assigned to the common dialect. This of itself is a remarkable circumstance; for, although a similar kind of separation has happened in Europe, yet we do not find that Latin & Greek ceased to be called Latin and Greek when they became the language of the learned, any more than we have at pre-



sent distinct names for the common dialect and literary language of modern nations."

Herein Monier Williams asserts 6 distinct propositions:—

*i.* That Sanskrit (well formed) is an artificial designation.

*ii.* That it is highly elaborate.

*iii.* That it was modified by the tongue of aboriginal tribes and gave rise to Bhasha.

*iv.* That Grammar is so elaborate that it was regarded as an end and not as a means.

*v.* That Sanskrit Grammar is an intricate science forced by a bristling barrier of technicalities.

*vi.* That Prakrit means the original tongue. We will take each of his propositions turn by turn.

A designation is artificial when it is arbitrarily chosen not on the ground of the sense expressed by it. For an individual being called John, or Monier Williams, John Monier Williams, is an artificial designation, because it does not signify any attribute or attributes of the individual which the word Monier Williams denotes. Well then Sanskrit is an artificial designation. He himself admits that Sanskrit means well formed. Let us see if Sanskrit is well formed. \*    °    °    °    °    °

## LECTURE I.

### THE HYMNS OF THE VEDAS.

—:O:—

**I** come now to Monier Williams' Lecture on "The Hymns of the Vedas." He proposes in this lecture to offer examples of the most remarkable religious, philosophical and ethical teachings of ancient Hindu authors. He can hardly convey 'an adequate idea of the luxuriance of Sanskrit literature.' He complains of 'the richness of the materials' at his command, for he confesses his inability to do justice to it. But let us not think that a man of Monier Williams' temper can ever be too warm in his panegyrics on such bosh as Hindu writings. They are 'too often marked by tedious repetitions, redundant epithets and far-fetched conceits.' In Sanskrit there is not to be found that coldness and severe simplicity which characterizes an Englishman's writings. He lives in a climate too cold to admit of oriental warmth of style. He is surrounded by too severe and simple a civilisation in England to admit of the gentle but complex civilisation of India. The standard of judgment set upon India differs very much from that set upon England. 'With Hindu authors excellence is apt to be measured by magnitude,' and 'quality by quantity.' But he can not close his eyes against 'the art of condensation so successfully cultivated as in some departments of Sanskrit Literature' (he means the Sutras). And in reconciling his view with the existence of the Sutras, Professor Williams offers an explanation. It is this, "Probably the



very prolixity natural to Indian writers led to the opposite extreme of brevity, not merely by a law of reaction, but by the necessity for providing the memory with aids and restoratives when oppressed and debilitated by too great a burden." Professor Williams would have been perfectly right in passing the above remarks, were it not that the Sanskrit writings that abound in prolixity have followed and not preceded the condensed literature in point of time. Leaving out of account the Vedas which are the starting point of Indian literature, the Upanishats the Upavedas and especially the six Darshanas may be called the condensed literature of India ; whereas the later novels, dramas, *puranas* and *vrithis* and *tikas* may, with perfect truth, be styled the prolix literature of India. Now, not a single line of the Upanishats or the Upavedas or the Darshanas was written posterior to the *puranas*, the dramas, &c ; and Professor Williams also admits this. What meaning are we to attach then to Williams' assertion that the condensed literature was due to a law of reaction ? Does Monier Williams mean that long before there had occurred an action *i. e.* long before the prolix literature came to be written, there had set in a reaction *i. e.* that of condensed writings ? Monier Williams is much to be credited for his logic, for, according to him, a reaction precedes the action of which it is a reaction. Supernatural Christianity, which is the religion of Monier Williams, finds a very true advocate in him. A son without a father is what Christianity would have us believe. But Monier Williams would rather that the son

existed long before the birth of his father. We shall find as we proceed further on that this is not in any way a startling proposition as compared with others that Monier Williams has yet to assert. His second reason is that the ancient had recourse to the condensed methods of writing as aids and restoratives to an oppressed and debilitated memory. Now, gentlemen, be fair and judge among yourselves. What was there to oppress and debilitate the memory. Was it the Upanishats, the Upavedas or the Brahmanas? Professor Williams must be bluntly ignorant of Sanskrit literature, if he thinks the Upanishats, the Brahmanas or the Upavedas could oppress or debilitate the memory. It is one of modern civilisation to deteriorate the intellect and enslave memory. I here quote from a number of a well-known scientific paper, "Nature," dated 25th January, 1883.

"Few students of science can fail to feel at times appalled by the ever increasing flood of literature devoted to science and the difficulty of keeping abreast of it even in one special and comparatively limited branch of inquiry. Were merely the old societies and long established journals to continue to supply their contributions, these, as they arrive from all parts of the country and from all quarters of the globe, would be more than enough to tax the energy of even the most ardent enthusiast. But new societies, new journals, new independent works start up at every turn, till one feels inclined to abandon in despair the attempt to keep pace with the advance of science in more than one limited department."



"One of the most striking and dispiriting features of this rapidly growing literature is the *poverty* or *worthlessness* of a *very large part* of it. The really earnest student who honestly tries to keep himself acquainted with what is being done, in at least his own branch of science, acquires *by degrees* a knack of distinguishing, as it were by instinct, the papers that he ought to read from those which have no claim on his attention. But how often may he be heard asking if no means can be devised for preventing the current of scientific literature from becoming swollen and turbid by the constant inpouring of what he can call by no better name than rubbish." If more required on this head, I would refer the reader to the prevalent systems of education for a verification of the results. Who is here that does not acknowledge the all-importance of *cramming* in passing the examination?

Who is here that would not evince to the fact of mathematics and even philosophy being nowadays learnt on the cram system? It is not India alone that is teeming with these deformities. Much more so is this case with England. There the cry of memory complaints has risen so high that many professors have set up entirely new schools of memory training with the express object of saving poor English memories from utter destruction and ruin. Is it not clear, then, that the prolixity of literature, the "exuberant verbosity," and the worthlessness and rubbish character, of which Monier Williams so much complains, are more to be found in his own camp of modern civilisation than in the natural, simple, and

invigorating writings of the authors of the Upanishats, the Upavedas and the Darshanas, To prove this, let me quote here from the well-known Upaveda, Sushruta, on medical science.

“ सूक्ष्माहि द्रव्यरस गुण वीर्य विपाक दोष धातु  
मलाशय मर्मासिरा मायुसंध्यश्निगर्भसम्भवद्रव्यसमू-  
हविभागास्तथा मनश्चक्षुर्लोक्षरणव्रणविनिश्चय भग्न  
विकल्पाः साध्ययाप्यप्रत्यख्येयता च विकाराणामिव-  
मादयश्चान्ये विशेषाः सहस्रशो ये विचिंत्यमाना  
विमल विपुल बुद्धेरपि बुद्धिमाकुली कुर्युः किं पुनर-  
ल्पबुद्धेः तस्मादवश्यमनुपदपादश्लोकार्धश्लोकमनुवर्ण-  
यितव्यमनुश्रोतव्यञ्च ॥ अध्याय ४ ॥

The meaning of which is that the various physiological subjects, called *dravya, rasa, guna, virya, &c., &c.*, are subjects, which sometimes even puzzle the most clear-headed intellect. Let every student of medical science then, apply his *buddhi* (intellect) in comprehending these principles and let him reflect. There is no need of multiplying quotations, for, it cannot be doubted that the Upanishats, the Niruktas, the Upavedas and the Darshanas are all addressed to the intellect, and the complaint is that they often puzzle the most clear-headed intellect and not that they cannot be remembered. It is clear, then, that the condensed literature of Sanskrit, the Sutas, are not due to reaction, and that they are



not aids or restoratives to memory, but rather appeal to the intellect or the faculties of understanding.

Professor Williams now passes from this, which is a pure digression from the subject, to the proper subject. Only once before the treatment of the subject, like an impartial writer, he inculcates the duty of studying fairly & without prejudice the other religions of the world. That his fairness and freedom from prejudice may not be ill judged, I again quote from the fair and unprejudiced Christian, Professor Monier Williams :

“For may it not be maintained, that the traces of the original truth imparted to mankind should be diligently sought for in every religious system, however corrupt, so that when any fragment of the living rock is discovered, it may at once be converted into a fulcrum for the upheaving of the whole mass of surrounding error ? At all events, it may reasonably be conceded that if nothing true or sound can be shown to underlie the *rotten tissue* of decaying religious systems, the truth of Christianity may at least in this manner be more clearly exhibited and its value by contrast made more conspicuous.

Leaving Monier Williams with his hopes regarding the not decaying but living Christianity aside for the moment we come now to the proper subject. Professor Williams confesses that “the idea of a revelation, though apparently never entertained in a definite manner by the Greeks and Romans, is perfectly familiar to the Hindus.” But the Vedas are not a revelation in the sense in which the

Bible is so to the Christian or the Qoran to the Mahomedan.

The Qoran is "a single volume manifestly the work of one author descended entire from heaven in the night called *al qadr*, in the month of Ramazan" "The Old Testament was furnished with its accompaniments of Chaldee translations and paraphrases called Targums," But "the word Veda," says Professor Williams, "means knowledge; and is a term applied to Divine *unwritten* knowledge, imagined to have issued like breath from the Self-existent, and communicated to no single person, but to a whole class of men called Rishis or inspired sages. By them the divine knowledge thus apprehended was transmitted, not in writing, but through the ear, by constant oral repetition, through a succession of teachers who claimed as Brahmins to be its rightful recipient.....Moreover, when at last, by its continued growth, it became too complex for mere oral transmission, then this Veda resolved itself, not into one single volume, like the Qoran, but into a whole series of compositions, which had in reality been composed by a number of different poets and writers at different times during several centuries."

Monier Williams herein asserts :

- I. That the Vedas are really unwritten knowledge issuing like breath from the Self-existent.
- II. That they were communicated to a whole class of men called Rishis or inspired sages.
- III. That they continued to grow, hence their present written book form.



IV. That the Vedas are a series of compositions by a number of different poets and writers at different times during several centuries.

We will take Professor William's propositions one by one. His first proposition is that the Vedas are really *unwritten knowledge* issuing like breath from the Self-existent. Now, does Professor Williams imagine that there can ever be anything like a written knowledge? Be it here clearly understood that I am not here speaking of the knowledge being written down, but of written knowledge. Professor Williams seems to imagine that the Vedas are laboring under a very serious defect. The Christians, he seems to think, have a definite revelation, as it is put down in black and white; and so have the Mahomedans, for, their book descended from heaven in its present form. He therefore imagines that the Christians have a settled revelation, a something definite to lay their hands upon as their sacred books, but the Veda being *unwritten knowledge* is not tangible, is not a reality or a something definite. In this he is entirely wrong, and if not wrong he very sadly betrays a want of philosophical culture. For, Vedas being *unwritten knowledge*, let me ask, Can there be anything which can with philosophical precision be called written knowledge? Let us be clear on the subject. A revelation is a revelation in so far as it is revealed to somebody. The Bible is alleged to be a revelation, it was therefore revealed to somebody. A revelation is only a revelation

in so far as it is revealed to the intellect, *i.e.* in so far as the person to whom it is revealed, becomes directly conscious of the facts revealed. Admitting, then, that the Bible is a revelation, and that there was somebody to whom it was revealed, that somebody must have been conscious of the contents of this revelation. Is this his consciousness of the facts revealed, in any way distinct from the knowledge of the facts revealed? If not, then the Bible is a knowledge, and, in so far as it lay in the consciousness of the person to whom it was revealed, which is true revelation, it was unwritten knowledge. Thus, then, the Bible revelation is also an unwritten knowledge, and Professor Williams cannot in any way free himself from the dilemma that either Bible revelation itself is an unwritten knowledge and in that case does not differ in any way from the Revelation of the Vedas which is also unwritten knowledge, or that the Bible is a mere record not felt in consciousness but made to descend just as Qoran descended to Mahomed, Mahomed himself being illiterate, not understanding it but only being specially directed and empowered by God to commit it to writing for the spread of faith. In this case, the Bible is no more a revelation. It is a mere dead-letter book sent miraculously through some people who themselves did not understand it. Can Professor Williams get rid of this difficulty? The fact is that he wants to sing praises of popular dogmatic Christianity, and, afraid lest he should be called a heretic, condescends to let the Bible rot into a mere dead-letter book, rather than accept



a position which should make him be considered a heretic. Whether it is more philosophical to believe that God sent a sealed book which descended entire, or that God only reveals to the understanding of some who thus illuminated record down what they are revealed to, is for you to judge. So far with respect to the first part of the 1st proposition asserted by Professor Williams.

We now come to the 2nd part. This refers to the mode of revelation of the Vedas or the origin of the Vedas. He says :

"There are numerous inconsistencies in the accounts of the production of the Veda . . . . 1. One account makes it issue from the Self-existent like breath, by the power of *adrishta*, without any deliberation or thought on his part ; 2. another makes the four Vedas issue from Brahman like smoke from burning fuel ; 3. another educes them from the elements ; 4. another from Gayatri ; 5. a hymn in the Atharva Veda educes them from *kala* or Time (XIX. 54.) 6. The Shatapatha Brahman asserts that the creator brooded over the three worlds and thence produced three lights, the fire, the air and the sun, from which respectively were extracted the Rig, Yajur and Sam Veda. Manu (I. 23) affirms the same. 7. In the Purusha Sukta, the three Vedas are derived from the mystical victim Purusha. 8. Lastly, by the Mimansaka, the Veda is declared to be itself an eternal sound and to have existed absolutely from all eternity, quite independently of any utterer of its text. Hence it is often called

*shruta*, "what is heard," 9. In opposition to all this, we have the *rishis* themselves frequently intimating that the mantras were composed by themselves."

In this little paragraph Professor Williams points out that there are nine different conflicting theories maintained with respect to the production of the Vedas, and enumerates the nine theories and thinks that he has done enough to demolish the ground of Vedic revelation. But he is sadly mistaken. He simply betrays the woful depth of his ignorance of even the ordinary Sanskrit words, not to speak of the higher Sanskrit literature. The fact is that not only are there no nine conflicting hypotheses, but that these are one and the same hypothesis invariably maintained by each and all of the ancient Vedic writers. The one unitary conception concerning the production of the Vedas is that the Vedas are a spontaneous emanation from the deity, an involuntary natural and original procession of God's innate wisdom and knowledge principles into this world. It is this one uniform idea which is maintained throughout. Let us take each one of the theories enumerated by Professor Williams.

The Vedas issued from the Self-existent like breath  
Says the Shatapatha, Kand 14. Adhyaya 5—

एव वा अरेऽस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतद्यद्व  
गृहो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदो ऽथर्वागिरस इत्यादि ।—

The meaning is that Yajnavalkya replies to Maitreyi in answer to her question,—“O Maitreyi



the Vedas have proceeded from God, who is even more omnipresent than ether, and more extensive than space, as naturally and spontaneously as the breath proceeds spontaneously from the human organism," and not deliberately and with thought as Professor Williams will have his own revelation, for the God of Truth and the God of the Universe, who is also the God of the Aryas, need not trouble the cerebral substance of his brain with violent vibrations to produce the thought of imparting a revelation to mankind. Wisdom and knowledge flow from God as naturally and spontaneously as the breath flows in and out from the human organism. The power of *adriskta* to which Professor Williams refers in his note, is nothing different from the invisible, spiritual potency of the recipients of the revelation to receive the revelation of the Vedas. This, then, is the first account.

We come now to the second. According to this, the Vedas issue from Brahman like smoke from burning fuel. The meaning is very clear. It is that the Vedas proceed from Brahman, God, as spontaneously as the smoke proceeds from burning fuel silently, noiselessly, naturally and without *any exertion*. The central idea is yet the same, but to the jaundiced eye of Monier Williams this is a second account inconsistent with the first.

The third hypothesis accounts for the origin of the Vedas from the elements. Here Professor Williams is wrong in his translation. The original word in Sanskrit for what he calls the elements is *bhuta*. Now *bhuta* does not mean elements but Godhead.

## भूतानि पदार्थानि विद्यन्तेऽस्मिन्निति भूतः—

God is called Bhuta, as all things that have ever existed exist in him. To convey the idea that the Vedas have existed for ever in the womb of the Divine, Wisdom, the Vedas are spoken of as issuing from Bhuta, *i.e.*, God who is the Universal intelligent repository of all things past, *i.e.*, all eternal essences and principles. This account does not in the least conflict with the first two but the poetical use of the word *bhuta* for God rather more sublimely expresss the same sentiment.

The fourth account is that of the Vedas proceeding from Gayatri. Here also Professor Williams betrays his entire ignorance of Vedic literature by saying that this fourth account is a different one, inconsistent with the three foregoing ones. In Nighantu, which is the lexicon of Vedic terms, 3rd Chapter, 14th Section, we have

गायति अर्चति कर्मो तस्माद् गायत्री भवति—

the meaning of which is that the root *Gayatri* signifies *archati* to worship. Hence, the Being who deserves to be adored and worshipped by all, is called *Gayatri*. So also says Nirukta in the 7th [Adhyaya, III Pad, and 6 Section,

गायत्री गायतेः स्तुति कर्मणस्त्रिं गमना वा

गायतो विपरीता सुखादुदपतदिति चब्रह्माणम् ॥

The Vedas, then, have proceeded from Gayatri, *i.e.*, God who is worshipped and adored by all.

Now comes the 5th account of the same in the 3rd Mantra of 5th Kanda of 19th Chapter.



कालादृचः समभवन् यजुः कालादजायतः

which Monier Williams translates as if meaning that Rig and Yajur Vedas have been produced by Time *kal*. Here again, our learned Boden Professors of Sanskrit & world-renowned Oriental scholars does not understand the meaning of the word *Kal*. Says the Nighantu, Chap. II, Kanda 14,

कालयति गति कर्मा तस्मात् कालः—

which means that the spirit that is intelligent and pervades all, is called *kala*, or

कलयति सखयति सर्वान् पदार्थान् स कालः—

that Infinite Being, in whose comparison all that exists is measurable, is called *kala*. *Kala*, therefore, is the name of the same Infinite Being, the same God Gayatri or Brahma or Swayambhu from whom the Vedas have been described to proceed in the first four accounts given of it.

We come now to the sixth. No mistake can be more serious on the part of Monier Williams than the one he has committed in rendering the Shatpatha Brahmana's account of the origin of the Vedas. According to this account, the Creator brooded over the three worlds and thence produced three lights, fire, the air, and the sun, from which respectively were extracted the Rig, Yajur and Sama Veda. Here also Williams' mistake lies in substituting English words for Sanskrit ones. William's own translation only with the modification of putting the original Sanskrit words for which he has put the

English ones will be : God, the Creator, brooded over the three worlds and thence produced the three *jjotis*, *agni*, *vayu* and *ravi* and thence extracted the three Vedas. Now *jjoti* does not mean light but illuminated being, man in the spiritual state, *i. e.* in the superior condition, and *agni*, *vayu* and *ravi* are no names for fire, air and sun, but are names of three men. The meaning of the passage, then, is that God in the beginning created the organizations which received the spirits of three men known by the names of Agni, Vayu and Ravi. To these three rishis, *agni*, *vayu* and *ravi* men in the superior condition, God revealed the knowledge of Rig, Yajur and Sama respectively. Now, in what, light does it contradict the other explanations? Nor does Manu prove what Williams says. Says Manu—

अग्निवायुरविभ्यस्तु त्रयं ब्रह्म सनातनम् ।

दुदोह यज्ञसिद्धयर्थमृग्यजुः साम लक्षणम् ॥

This means that the three Vedas, Rig, Yajur and Sama were revealed to the three Rishis, Agni, Vayu and Ravi to give a knowledge of how to accomplish the purpose of life in this world.

We come now to the 7th account in Purusha Sukta, where, according to Monier Williams, the Vedas are derived from the mystical victim, Purusha. I here quote the Mantra of the Purusha Sukta:—



तस्माद्यज्ञात्सर्वं हुत ऋचः सामानि जज्ञिरे

चन्दाष्ति जज्ञिरे तस्माद्यजुस्तस्मादजायत ॥

The plain meaning of which is that Rig, Yajuh, Sama, and Chhandas or Atharva Veda have proceeded from that Purusha who is Yajna and Sarvahuta. Williams renders it into the mystical victim, Purusha. But he is in the wrong. Purusha is the Universal Spirit that pervades all nature. Says Nirukta, II, 1. 5 :—

पुरुषः पुरिषादः पुरिषयः पूरयतेर्वा

पूरयत्यन्तरित्यन्तरपुरुषमभिप्रेत्य ॥

यस्मात्परं नापरमस्ति किञ्चिद्

यस्मान्नाणोयो न जग्रायोऽस्ति किञ्चित् ।

वृक्ष इव स्तम्भो दिवि तिष्ठत्येकम्

तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ॥

इत्यपि निगमो भवति ॥

the meaning of which is that God is called Purusha, because he is *purishadya*, that is, he pervades the universe and even lives in the interior of the human soul. It is in this sense that the mantra of the Veda is revealed, saying there is nothing superior to God, nothing separate from him, nothing more refined, nothing more extended. He holds all but is himself unmoved. He is the only one. Yes, he, even he, is the spirit that

pervades all. It is clear then that Purusha means the Universal Spirit of God. We come now to the second word *Yajna*. Says Nirukta, III. 4. 2.—

यज्ञः कस्मात् प्रख्यातं यजतिकर्मेति नैरुक्ता  
याचक्ष्यो भवतीति वा यजुरुक्त्रो भवतीति वा  
बहुक्क्षणाजिन इत्यौपमन्यवो यजुष्ये न नयन्तीति ।

The meaning is this. Why is *yajna* the name of God? Because He is the prime mover of all the forces of nature ; because He is the only being to be worshipped ; and because to Him the Yajur mantras point out. The meaning then, of the passage of Purusha Sukta quoted by Williams is this : From that God who is called Purusha, *i.e.* the Universal Spirit, and who is also called Yajna for reasons given above, have proceeded the Rig, Yajuh, Sama and Atharwan.

Eighthly, the Mimansakas declare the Vedas to be eternal and independently existent, a view which does not at all conflict with the former ones.

And lastly, says Williams, "We have the Rishis themselves frequently intimating that the mantras were composed by themselves." In these days of spiritualism, no wonder if the spirits of the Rishis might have appeared before Monier Williams and mystically whispered into his ears the composition of the Vedas by themselves. But in so far as the writings of the Rishes themselves go, not only is the assertion of Williams merely false and



baseless but positively injurious and very perverted. For, the Rishis themselves declare themselves to be not at all the authors of the Vedas. The Vedas are regarded by all of them as *apauruṣheya*, i. e., not the production of human beings. I will quote here Nirukta I. 6. 5.—

साक्षात् कृतधर्माण ऋषयो वभूवुस्ते ऽवरेभ्योऽ

साक्षात् कृतधर्मभ्य उपदेशेन मंत्रान्तं संप्रादुः

Also, Nirukta II 3. 2.

ऋषिर्हर्षनात् स्तोमान् ददर्शेत्यौपमन्य-

वस्त्यदेनांस्तपस्यमानान् ब्रह्म स्वम्भ्व-

भ्यनर्षत्तदृषोणामृषित्वमिति विज्ञायते ॥

The meaning of these is that Rishis were those people who had realised the truths in the mantras and having done so began to enlighten those of their fellow-brethren who were ignorant of the truths in the same. Further on, says Aupamanyava, the rishis are only the *seers* of the mantras, but not the composers.

We have now shortly dismissed with the first proposition of Williams and partly with the second. The assertion of Williams that the mantras of the Vedas were composed by a whole class of men called Rishis is entirely baseless. Not only were they not composed by the whole class, but not even by one individual of that class. The reason why Williams regards this to be so, is that every mantra of the Vedas gives four things, its Chhanda,

Swara, Devata and Rishi. The name of the rishi only indicates the man who for the first time taught the meanings of that mantra to the world at large.

The third proposition of Williams is that the Vedas continued to grow till they became so bulky that their division into the present four volumes became necessary. Here again Monier Williams betrays his ignorance of Sanskrit. For, the four-fold classification of the Vedas which according to Williams is due to the accretion of compositional matter, and not to any systematic and logical principle. I refer the reader to what I wrote in the Terminology of the Vedas :—

“The word *rig* signifies the expression of the nature and proper ties of, and the actions and re-actions produced by substances, Hence, the name has been applied to Rig Veda as its function is to describe the physical, chemical and active properties of all material *substances* as well as the psychological properties of all *mental substances*. Next to a knowledge of things, comes the practical application of that knowledge, for all knowledge has some end, that end being usefulness to man. Hence, Yajur Veda comes next to Rig Veda, the meaning of Yajur being application. It is upon this double principle of liberal and professional or technical education that the well-known division of the course of study of Aryans, the Vedas, into Rig and Yajur is based.”

After a knowledge of the universe and the practice of that knowledge, comes the elevation and exaltation of



human faculties, which alone is compatible with the true Upasna of Brahma. The Sama Veda has, for its function, the expression of those mantras which lead to this exaltation of mind, in which one enters in the superior condition and becomes illuminated.

Let us not mock at the position taken by the Aryas with respect to the nature of the Vedas, for there are reasons enough to justify this position. Not being a novel position at all, it is the position that is maintained even according to the Hindu systems of mythology which are but gross corrupt distortions of the Vedic sense and meaning. The broad and universal distinction of all training into professional and liberal, has been altogether lost sight of in the Puranic mythology, and like everything else has been contracted into a narrow-superstitious sphere of shallow thought. The Vedas, instead of being regarded as universal text books of liberal and professional sciences, are now regarded as simply codes of religious thought. Religion, instead of being grasped as the guiding principle of all active propensities of human nature, is regarded as an equivalent of certain creeds and dogmas. So with the Rig and Yajur Vedas. Yet, even in this distorted remnant of Aryan thought and wisdom, the Puranic mythology, the division of the Vedas into Rig and Yajur, the liberal & the professional, is faithfully preserved. The *rig*, now, implies a collection of hymns and songs in praise and *description* of various gods and goddesses ; whereas Yajuh, now, stands for the

mantras recited in the ritual, the active part of religious ceremonies. This is the view taken by the so-called scholars of the day.

We come now to Williams' account of the Vedas. He says that the Vedas consist of 3 parts. I Mantra, II Brahmana and III Upanishad. We will not dwell here upon the fact that the mantras only are the Vedas and not the Brahmanas and the Upanishads, for the Brahmanas and the Upanishads are mere commentaries of the Vedas. He says—

“ They (the mantra portion of the Vedas according to Williams) are comprised in 5 principal Sanhitas or collections of Mantras, called respectively Rig Atharvan, Saman, Taitreya and Vajasaneya.”

In one fullstop we have two assertions of Williams :—

- I. That Sanhita means a collection of Mantras.
- II. That there are five such collections, Rig, Atharva, Sama, Taitreya and Vajasaneya.

The Sanhita should mean a collection is another indication of Williams' ignorance of Sanskrit Grammar. Says Panini I. 4 107. *Parah sannikarshah Sanhita*, which means that the *sannikarsh* of one *pad* with another is called Sanhita. To make the distinction clear, I will refer the reader not to Panini but to Oriental scholars themselves. Recently there have been published two editions of Rig Veda, 1. Sanhita Patha and 2. Pad Patha. Both are collections of Mantras, but not Sanhitas. Now



did Sanhita mean collection of Mantras, Max Muller would not have unconsciously refuted himself and his brother scholar Monier Williams.

His second assertion is with respect to the number of the Vedas. Vajasaneya Sanhita is just what is known by the name of Yajur Veda, whereas Taitreya Sanhita is no Mantra Sanhita but Brahman Sanhita. Could Williams, unless he had a willingness to distort Sanskrit words and literature and a conscious desire to misrepresent & maliciously misreport every Vedic truth, have even committed a greater blunder than this? We are ever reading of Veda trayi and Veda chalushtayi but no one, not even Williams himself, has even heard or read of Veda Panchakam. The fact is that the reticence or abettment of other scholars has made Williams too bold, & there is not one lie regarding Sanskrit literature that his omnipotent secreted pen cannot convert into an *authoritative truth* for the blind followers of the blind. Having defined the Vedas as prayers, invocations and hymns, Williams then proceeds to the discussion of another question. I shall state it in his own words.

“ To what deities, it will be asked, were the prayers and hymns of these collections addressed? This is an interesting inquiry, for these were probably the very deities worshipped under similar names by our Aryan progenitors in their primeval home, somewhere on the table-land of Central Asia, perhaps in the region of Bokhara, not far from the sources of the Oxus. The answer is: They worshipped those physical forces

before which all nations, if guided solely by the light of nature, have in the early period of their life instinctively bowed down, and before which even the more civilized and enlightened have always been compelled to bend in awe and reverence, if not in adoration."\*

## LECTURE II.

### THE HYMNS OF THE VEDAS.

I come now to Monier Williams' criticism on the Vedas proper. Here is what Monier Williams has to say on the subject.

"In the Veda this unity soon diverged into various ramifications. Only a few of the hymns appear to contain the simple conception of one divine self-existent omnipresent Being, and even in these the idea of one God present in all nature is somewhat nebulous and undefined. Perhaps the most ancient and beautiful deification was that of Dyaus, 'the sky,' as Dyauh-pitar, 'Heavenly Father' (the Zeus or Jupiter of the Greeks and Romans). Then, closely connected with Dyaus, was a goddess A-diti, 'the Infinite Expanse,' conceived of subsequently as the mother of all the gods. Next came a development of the same conception called Varuna, 'the Investing Sky,' said to answer to Ahura

---

\*NOTE — The Author's criticism is missing. However Williams is entirely wrong in insinuating that the Vedas inculcate element worship. Swami Dayanand Saraswati has satisfactorily refuted this assertion of the Europeans in his Introduction to the Vedas. — *Ed.*



Mazda, the Ormazd of the ancient Persian (Zand) mythology, and to the Greek *Oupavos*—but a more spiritual conception, leading to a worship which rose to the nature of a belief in the great      •      •      •      This Varuna, again, was soon thought of in connection with another somewhat vague personification called Mitra, 'god of day.' After a time these impersonations of the sky and celestial sphere were felt to be too vague. Soon, therefore, the great investing firmament resolved itself into separate cosmical entities with separate powers and attributes. First, the watery atmosphere—personified under the name of Indra, ever seeking to dispense his dewy treasures (*indu*), though ever restrained, secondly, the wind—thought of either as a single personality named Vayu, or as a whole assemblage of moving powers coming from every quarter of the compass, and impersonated as Maruts or 'Storm-gods.' At the same time in this process of decentralization—if I may use the term—the once purely celestial Varuna became relegated to a position among seven secondary deities of the heavenly sphere called Adityas (afterwards increased to twelve, and regarded as diversified forms of the sun in the several months of the year), and subsequently to a dominion over the water when they had left the air and rested on the earth.

"Of these separately defined physical forces by far the most favourite object of adoration was the deity supposed to yield the dew and rain, longed for by Eastern cultivators of the soil with even greater crav-

ings than by Northern agriculturists. Indra, therefore—the Jupiter Pluvius of early Indian mythology—is undoubtedly the principal divinity of Vedic worshippers, in so far at least as the greater number of their prayers and hymns are addressed to him.

“What, however, could rain effect without the aid of heat? A force the intensity of which must have impressed an Indian mind with awe, and led him to invest the possessor of it with divine attributes. Hence the other great god of Vedic worshippers, and in some respects the most important in his connection with sacrificial rites, is Agni (Latin *Ignis*), ‘the god of fire.’ Even Surya, ‘the sun’ (Greek *helios*), who was probably at first adored as the original source of heat, came to be regarded as only another form of fire. He was merely a manifestation of the same divine energy removed to the heavens, and consequently less accessible. Another deity, Ushas, ‘goddess of the dawn,’—the Aurora of the Greeks,—was naturally connected with the sun, and regarded as daughter of the sky. Two other deities, the Asvins, were fabled as connected with Ushas, as ever young and handsome, travelling in a golden car and precursors of the dawn. They are sometimes called *Dasras*, as divine physicians, ‘destroyers of diseases;’ sometimes *Nasatyas*, as ‘never untrue.’ They appear to have been personifications of two luminous points or rays imagined to precede the break of day. These, with Yama, ‘the god of departed spirits,’ are the principal deities of the Mantra portion of the Veda.”



Herein there are 13 points that Monier Williams brings in & also exactly 13 points that can be disputed. Williams points out that the Vedas sanction the worship of—

1. Dyaūh-pitar, as the father of the sky, which Dyauh-pitar among the Greeks or Romans becomes Zeus or Jupiter.

2. Aditi, the goddess of infinite expanse, mother of all gods.

3. Varuna, the god of investing sky, corresponding to Ahurmuza of Persians and Ozr and Gos of the Greeks.

4. Mitra, the god of day, associate of Varuna.

5. Indra, the god of the watery atmosphere.

6. Vritra, the spirit of evil that opposed Indra.

7. Vayu, the god of wind.

8. Marutah, the storm-gods.

9. Adityas, who were first regarded as seven in number. The number was finally increased to 12. The worship of the sun and 12 solar months being thus established.

10. Agni, the god of fire.

11. Ushah, the goddess of dawn.

12. Ashwin, the twin precursors of dawn, called also Daxas or doctors and Nasatyas or never untrue.

13. Yama, the god of departed spirits.

Each one of these positions can be disputed, but I have neither time enough nor Williams' provocation to do so. It would take us a long time to run over the list of these 13 gods and show that Williams has not understood any one of these. But it would be useless, as

Williams only quotes the Vedas on the subject of only seven out of these thirteen, *i. e.*, Varuna, Mitra, Indra, Aditya, Agni, Ashwin and Yama, and two more, Kala or Time, and Ratri or Night, and leaves the remaining out of the 13 undiscussed.

In a future lecture we shall take up each of these quotations in turns and show the strength of the proof on which Williams bases the truth of his assertions. But at present I have neither time enough nor the disposition to perform this task, as another and more important question is pressing. Suffice it to say then that in the opinion of Monier Williams the Vedas are records of a rude and barbarous age when fetish worship prevailed, when the various objects and forces of nature, like the sky, the firmament, the vast expanse, the day, the watery atmosphere, the cloud, the wind, the storm, the rain, the sun with its 12 months, the fire, the dawn, the day-break and the spirits of the dead were worshipped. Of course, Monier Williams asserts that the deified forces addressed in the mantras, were probably not represented by images or idols in the Vedic period; but he says that doubtless the early worshippers clothed their gods with human form in their imaginations. Williams panegyric, then, on the non-idolatrous character of the Vedas is a mere panegyric and no more. His object is, however, to show that, notwithstanding all allowances that can be made, the Vedas are, at the best, books that contain fetish worship and low, uncivilized theology. For, let me remind you of the question that I read in the beginning. He says—



"In the Veda, this unity soon diverged into various ramifications. Only a few of the hymns appear to contain the simple conception of one divine self-existent omnipresent Being and even in these the idea of one God present in all nature is somewhat nebulous & undefined."

May object to-day is simply to point out that nowhere can these remarks of Williams be so well applicable as in the case of the Bible, the Bible which Monier Williams holds in such esteem, the Bible which he calls the sacred word of God, teaching the only true religion, as opposed to the three false religions of the world,—Brahmanism, Islam and Buddhism, whereas the Vedas do not only in a few passages contain the simple conception of a divine self-existent omnipresent Being, but throughout the Vedas we find God described as a divine self-existent and omnipresent Being, and not only is this idea not cloudy or nebulous and undefined even in these passages; but there can possibly be no clearer statements of the subject than those contained in the Vedas.

I shall show that the Vedas only sanction pure undefined monotheism, whereas the Bible is the book wherein the idea of one divine, self-existent, omnipresent God is most nebulous and extremely undefined.

To come to the Vedas.

तमोशानं जगतस्तस्युषस्यतिं  
धियं जित्त्वमवसे हृमहे वयं ॥  
पद्म नी यथा वेदमामसद् धे

रक्षिता पायुरदब्धः स्वस्तये ।

ऋ० १ अ० ६ व० १५ म० ५ ॥

the meaning of which is—We worship Him, the Lord of the universe of the inanimate and the animate creation, for He is the blessing of our intellect and our protector. He dispenses life and good among all. Him do we worship, for as He is our preserver and benefactor, so is He our way to bliss and happiness also.

Again—

तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति मूरयः ।

दिवीव चक्षुराततम् ॥ ऋ० अ० २ व० ७ म० ५ ॥

The wise people always desire to obtain communion, with Him who pervades everywhere, for He is everywhere. Neither time nor space, nor substance can divide Him. He is not limited to one time or one place or one thing but is everywhere just as the light of the sun pervades everywhere in unobstructed space.

Again—

परीत्य भूतानि परीत्य लोकान्

परीत्य सर्वाः प्रदिशो दिशश्च ।

उपस्थाय प्रथमजामृतस्यात्मना

आत्मानमभिसंनिवेश ॥ य० ३२ । ११ ॥

God pervades through all matter and space, even the distant suns, the far off directions and is consciously



present everywhere. He is even conscious of His own powers. He made the elemental atoms with which to begin the creation of the Universe. He is all-bliss and eternal happiness. Any human soul that perceives and realises the existence of this divine Being within himself and lives ever in the presence of his God, is saved.

महद्यत्तं भुवनस्य मध्यं

तपसि क्रान्तं सलिलस्य पृष्ठे ।

तस्मिंश्च यन्ति य उ केच देवा

वृक्षस्य स्कन्धः परित इव शाखाः ॥

अथर्व० कां० १० प्रपा० २३ अनु० ४ मं ३८ ॥

Brahma who is the greatest of all and worthy of being revered by all, who is present in all the worlds, and fit to be worshipped, whose wisdom & knowledge are boundless, who is even the support of the infinite space, in whom all reside and are supported, as a tree resides in the seed and is supported by it, so is the world supported by Him.

न द्वितीयो न तृतीयश्चतुर्थो नाप्युच्यते ॥

न पञ्चमो न षष्ठः सप्तमो नाप्युच्यते ॥

नाष्टमो न नवमो दशमो नाप्युच्यते ॥

तस्मिदं निगतं सहः स एष एक एक हृदेक एव ॥

सर्वे अस्मिन् देवा एक वृत्तो भवन्ति ॥

अ० को० १३ अ० ४ मं १६—२१ ॥

He is only one, there is no second, no third, no fourth God. There is no fifth, no sixth, no seventh God. Yes, there is no eighth, nor ninth, nor tenth God. In Him the Unitary Being, all live, move and have their being.

You have seen then, what the religion of the Vedas is. Can there be any better, clearer, more distinct expression of monotheism than this? Can we better assert the divinity and omnipresence of God?

We come now to the Bible, the pet darling of Monier Williams, the Christians' rock of ages, the Bible, to prove the excellence of which Monier Williams so misinterprets, distorts and vilifies the Vedas.

Bishop Watson in his letters to Thomas Paine said, "An honest man, sincere in his endeavours to search out truth in reading the Bible, would examine first whether the bible attributed to the Supreme Being any attribute repugnant to holiness, truth, justice, goodness, whether it represented him as subject to human infirmities."—B. Watson, p. 114.

I would follow the same course.....We find that the Bible does represent God as subject to human infirmities and that it does attribute to him attributes repugnant to holiness, truth, justice and goodness.

It represents God as subject to human infirmities. It represents him as having *a body*, subject to wants and weaknesses like those of ourselves. When he appears to Abraham, he appears, according to the Bible, as three angels. Then they talk to Abraham, &c.\*

---

\* The MS. is missing.



## LECTURE IV.

In this lecture, I propose to deal with the 50th Sukt of the first *Ashtaka* of the Rigveda, whose translation as well as remarks thereupon by Monier Williams, I subjoin herewith. Says Monier Williams :—

“The next deity is Surya, the sun,\* who, with reference to the variety of his functions, has various names—such as Savitri, Aryaman, Mitra, Varuna, Pushan, sometime ranking as distinct deities of the celestial sphere. As already explained, he is associated in the minds of Vedic worshippers with fire, and is frequently described as sitting in a chariot drawn by seven ruddy horses (representing the seven days of the week), preceded by the Dawn. Here is an example of a hymn (Rigveda I, 50) addressed to this deity, translated almost literally :—

Behold the *rays of dawn* like heralds, lead on high

The Sun, that men may see the great all-knowing God.

The stars slink off like *thieves* in company with Night,

Before the all-seeing eye, whose beams reveal his presence,

Gleaming like brilliant flames, to nation after nation.

With speed, beyond the ken of mortals, thou, O Sun,

Dost ever travel on, conspicuous to all.

Thou dost create the light, and with it dost illumine

---

\* Yaska makes Indra, Agni and Surya the Vedic Triad of gods,

The universe entire ; thou risest in the sight  
 Of all the race of men, and all the host of heaven.  
 Light-giving Varuna ! thy piercing glance doth scan  
 In quick succession all this stirring, active world,  
 And penetrateth too the broad ethereal space,  
 Measuring our days and nights and spying out all  
 creatures.

Surya, with flaming locks, clear-sighted god of day,  
 Thy seven ruddy mares bear on thy rushing car.  
 With these thy self-yoked steeds, seven daughters of thy  
 chariot,

On ward thou dost advance. To thy refulgent orb,  
 Beyond this lower gloom and upward to the light.

Would we ascend, O Sun, thou god among the gods."  
 In this paragraph Monier Williams asserts—

(i) That Surya, the sun, was worshipped as a deity  
 under different names, Savitri, Aryaman, Mitra, Varuna  
 and Pushan.

(ii) That in the minds of Vedic worshippers Surya  
 was associated with Fire.

(iii) That Surya is described as sitting in a chariot  
 drawn by seven ruddy horses preceded by the Dawn.

(iv) That these ruddy horses represent the seven,  
 days of the week.

(v) Monier Williams subjoins an almost literal  
 translation of the 50th Sukta of the 1st Ashtaka of the  
 Rigveda, which has been mentioned before.

I need not say that Pushan, Varuna, Mitra, Aryaman  
 and Savitri are other names of the same Surya, and that



Agni is also another name for it, but unlike Williams they are not the different names under which Surya or rather the God of the universe *jagatastasthushah*, that is the Universal Spirit that prevades the whole animate and inanimate creation.

The *sapta harita* are not the seven ruddy horses of the sun that pull his chariot, nor has the sun any chariot. *Sapta harita* are the seven rays as shall appear further in. The *ratha* means this sublime universe. The seven days of the week are not the seven *haritas*.<sup>o</sup>

---

\* The MS. is missing.

## REV. T. WILLIAMS' CRITICISM

On Niyoga.

Says a writer,—“To ascertain what a person's character is, inquire of him concerning the God in which he has faith—and his reply,—if legitimately and honestly stated,—will be a disclosure of *his own* disposition and spiritual or intellectual growth.”

This proposition is perfectly true. The whole experience of men and nations justifies it, and the Bible of the Christians is also a proof of it. “God made man in his own image,” says the Bible (Genesis 1, 26). Therefore man as an image, reveals the nature of God, or man is in his own notion just what his God is. Or, perhaps, it is more true to say that man makes God after his own image. Even in this case, one's God is a true index of his character and intellectual worth. Taking this truth as our guide, we wish to examine T. Williams's character and worth in this article as a critic of Dayananda. For, as it is invariably true that “it is a giddy head that thinks that the world turns round,” can it not be that what Mr. T. Williams stands himself accused of, is exactly what he charges Dayananda with? The fact is that T. Williams has the good fortune of wearing the spectacles of Christian prejudice, and to him, just as to a jaundiced eye, everything appears tinged with the colour of his spectacles. T. Williams in his article appended herewith charges Dayananda with :—

1. Having scant respect for the Vedas.
2. Preaching the *astounding, grossly immoral and monstrous* doctrine of Niyoga.



3. Having the unenviable distinction of so fathering the doctrine on the Rig Veda.

4. With telling a lie, gross lie, a deliberate lie, terrible lie, and with scandalously falsifying the Vedas.

5. With idiocy.

6. With being a dangerous enemy of the Vedas of his times, and lastly T. Williams, with a truly Christian spirit, absorbed at the pulpits, damns Dayananda and his doctrine.

In this article I shall make no distinction between "Lord" as occurring in the Old Testament and Christ. For, the "Lord" of the Old Testament is Jehovah or God, whereas the world-renowned (because of its pre-eminent intelligibility) doctrine of Trinity will have that God the Father (Jehovah), God the Son (Christ) & God the Holy Ghost (the Lord) are one and the same. I will, therefor, substitute for the word "Lord" in the Testament the word Christ, to give it a pleasant, modern Christian garb. And now to proceed with the subject. I shall show that what T. Williams accuse Dayananda of, if the Bible be true, is what Christ (Jehovah or Lord) stands accused of.

T. Williams accuses Swami Dayananda, firstly, of having scant respect for the Vedas.

Now to quote Paul (1 Cor. 7, 12): "But to the rest speak I, *not the Lord*." Again (2 Cor. 11, 17): "That which I speak, I speak it *not after the Lord*, but as it were fool-

*ashly*, in this confidence of boasting." Be it remembered that Paul is an inspired personage and Paul's inspiration which means Christ's thoughts, led him to say that what he is inspired of (a portion of the Bible), is after the Lord but foolish and uninspired. Therefore God or Christ stands accused of having scant respect for the Bible, for he declares that the Bible is not inspired.

Secondly, T. Williams accuses Swami Dayananda of preaching the astounding, grossly immoral, and monstrous doctrine of Niyoga. We quote from Deuteronomy XXV : 5—10. :—" If brethren dwell together, and one of them die and have no child the wife or the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger, her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her, to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her and it shall be that the first born, which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother, which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel. And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say my husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel. He will not perform the duty of my husband's brother. Then the elders of the city shall call him, and speak unto him : and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her ; then shall his brother's wife come unto him, in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot and spit in his face and shall answer and say, so shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house—and his name shall be called in Israe



the house of him that has his shoe loosed." This is clearly *Niyoga*, and so Christ stands accused of preaching the astounding, grossly immoral, and monstrous doctrine of *Niyoga*. And thirdly and consequently, Christ stands accused of having the unenviable distinction of having fathered this doctrine upon the Bible.

Fourthly, T. Williams accuses Dayananda of telling lie, a deliberate lie, and a scandalous falsification.

Now I Kings 22, 28. "And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said: thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so. Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these, thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." Again (2 Thes. 2. 11) "and for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion, that shall believe a lie."

Does not the Christian God here stand accused of putting lie in the mouth of his prophets, of deluding people by a lie, "a gross lie, a deliberate lie, a terrible lie, and a scandalous falsification?"

Fifthly, T. Williams charges Swami Dayananda with idiocy. "Idiocy," says Webster, "is a defect in understanding." To show that Christ or God suffered from this defect we turn to Gen. 1-30, where it reads:—"And God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good." Here to God's understanding everything

he had made appeared *very good*. Again in the 6th Chapter and sixth verse of the same book, we read : "And it repented the Lord that he made man on the earth and it grieved him at his heart." From the above it is clear that time proved to God's defective understanding that he had cherished fallacious hopes of his creation being very good, on the contrary, it turned out a source of repentance and grief to him. Is not this defective understanding idiocy ? God or Christ, therefore, stands accused of idiocy with which T. Williams charges Swami Dayananda.

We have shown how Christ declares the Bible to be uninspired, and, therefore, declares himself also a dangerous enemy of his Bible. It is no wonder then that T. Williams should charge Swami Dayananda with being a dangerous enemy of the Vedas of his times.

And lastly, T. Williams, with a truly Christian spirit, throws his Missionary weapons against Swami Dayananda, whom he presents as exposed to a damning charge. This is no more unlike T. William's God than the former charges were. "The Bible represents God or Christ as cursing and as dooming to pain and agony, to servitude and death, whole races of his creatures, throughout all ages for the sin of one individual. It represents him as cursing all serpents, making them cursed above all cattle, dooming them to go on their belly and eat dust, as putting enmity in men's hearts towards them, because one solitary serpent tempted Eve. It represents him as dooming all women, as cursing the earth for the sin of one man



cursing it to bring forth thorns and thistles to annoy all future generations, dooming all mankind throughout all lands and throughout all ages to eat of the ground in sorrow all the days of their life, to eat the herb of the field, to eat their bread with the sweat of their brow, and lastly, to return to the dust. The thought is appalling. Countless millions mercilessly doomed to daily and hopeless misery for sins committed before any of them were born, as if this blasphemy were not enough."

One word before we come to the proper subject. Let T. Williams always remember what his Bible teaches. He lone should throw arrows at his brother who is himself innocent. Mr. Williams, you should first clear the Bible of its disgusting absurdities and monstrosities, its evil and pernicious doctrines, thus rendering yourself and your God innocent, before you raise your head to attack the doctrines of the Vedas, which, Biblically circumstanced as you are, notwithstanding your twenty years' patient study of Sanskrit, you are as unable to grasp as the little Grammar school-boy, his dusty Greek or Hebrew. And now to the subject.

Speaking of Rig, 10. 10. 10, the authority adduced by Swami, the Rev. Missionary says: "Are you not aware, Sir, that in what Dayananda quotes from Rig Veda 10. 10. 10, *the speaker is a brother and the woman he speaks to is that brother's sister !!!* The speaker is Yama and the woman he speaks to is Yami, aye, not only his sister, but his *twin* sister." It needed a special revelation in the nineteenth century on the Missionary elite, T. Williams, to know

that Yama and Yami were twin brother and sister. The proof of this revealed text of T. Williams' inspiration we will learn by and by, but the sinister motive in his insisting upon this personal revelation is obvious and it is purely Christian. Like a serpent under the rose, he throws his flattering, flowery feelers among the self-deluded Hindus, to exasperate them against the Aryas by joining in a common cause, pretending to show that since the mantra means Yami asking her brother Yama's hand and Yama refusing it, the Vedas do not sanction *Niyoga*. This is all pretence, the hidden insinuation is that there were ancient Aryans, the revered and sacred forefathers of the Hindus, the great olden Vedic Rishis, among whom even such depravity prevailed that a sister dared ask her twin brother's sacred *vrishily* hand. In the light of present criticism, such hypocrisy shall no longer last, and no more will T. Williams arrogate the position which belongs to God alone. Here is T. Williams' arrogant blasphemy:—"I say it with all positiveness that Dayananda knew that it was Yama that speaks and that he speaks to his twin sister Yami. How terrible then is the lie that he is guilty of." Poor Williams, is not your positiveness the most terrible lie that you are guilty of, terrible because you lie against a person, whose staunch moral character even outdoes your ideal Christ? (Vide Theosophist on the subject.)

As a proof of his assertion, T. Williams quotes Nirukta 6-5-5 and forgetting the original, falls upon a spurious commentary, but rising from his sleep comes to Nir. 11-



ri-13 and quoting Nir. "Yami Yamam chakame tam pieratya chakshu," which means, according to T. Williams, Yami desired sexual intercourse with Yama, he refused her." Where is T. Williams's positive assertion that Yama and Yami are brother and sister? Poor Williams can only reply, Yaska's commentator says expressly that Yama was Yami's brother. But as T. Williams says, "an author is not bound by what his commentator might say, Yaska's commentator shares a remorseless fate. Admitted that the Nirukta of Yaska is a *Vedanga*, and has full Vedic authority, we trust no one will be so mad as to believe, like Mr. T. Williams, that Niruka being a *Vedanga* its commentary too is a *Vedanga*. Impotent Christian logic !!

He comes now to Katyayana, whose words are, "vaiyasvatayor yama—yam yoh samvadah." Now learned T. Williams, the infallible authority on Sanskrit, translates *Vaivasvatavor* into son and daughter of Vaivasvat and thus infallibly proves that the hymn is a conversation between twin brother and sister. But says Nirukta, 7-26, "Vaivasvata adityad vivasanvan prerat vata pragatadva," which means that Vivasvat is the sun. Again in Nirukta, 12-10, we read 'Adityad Yman mithunaw janayam chakar,' and in 12-11 we read, "ratri radityaya adit yodayeantardhiajate," which means, wherever Yama Yami, the couple, are mentioned in connection with Vaivasvat, the sun, the meaning of the allegory cleared is, that the night or gloom disappears on the rise of the sun. Has this any thing to do with Yama and Yami, the

twin brother and sister, the sons of Vaivasvat? Absolutely nothing. There is in this allegory no trace of Yami asking the hand of Yama, or the reverse. But Katayana, whose authority need not be forced upon us, simply means that Yama meaning a person desirous of continuing the control of his passion, and Yami a similar woman, the hymn in an allegorical conversation, describes the duty of such male and female persons.

T. Williams comes thirdly to the mantras themselves. He is very proud of counting Yama and Yami six times and three times each proper names and his proofs of these as proper names are curious. His first proof is that in the 13th verse, Yama occurs in the vocative case and Yami in the fourteenth verse in the same case. Is not T. Williams ashamed of his logic, after he has read our criticism on his last article on the Idolatry in the Vedas? We quote from Solomon's song 13. 16 "Awake O, north wind and come thou south." Here wind is in the vocative case. Will T. Williams Biblical logic believe that "wind" is a proper name? Again we quote from the book of the prophet Isaiah, 1-2, "Hear, O, heavens and give ear O, earth." Are "heavens" and "earth" proper names? Again in Isaiah, 12-13, "O ye travelling companies," is "companies" a proper name? T. Williams has, perhaps, learnt his Bible and grammar in a Mission School only, or he would not have fallen upon such admirable logic which shines out off the Bible.

T. Williams now discovers the relationship of his "vocative case proper names." He says, that Yama



calls Yami his kinswoman "salakshma." Does "salakshma" mean kinswoman or "of similar virtues?"

"Further on," Williams says, "in the fourth verse, Yama says that Gandharv and his watery wife were their source—*nabhi*, and that their relationship was consanguinous—*Jami*." Watery wives a Biblical imagination only can conceive, and the husband of such a watery wife, Gandarv must be residing in tracts of waters mid navel people unknown to ancient Aryans, the inhabitants of the *land* of Arya Varta. T. Williams has not even that grain of human dignity and pride which keeps a man consistent. Are Yama and Yami the son and daughter of Vaivasvat or of Gandarv and his watery wife? T. Williams should have answered this question to himself before rushing into print. Again says he, "in the 8th verse, Yami that Twashtri formed them as husband and wife, *dampati*, in the womb." This, instead of proving Yama and Yami as twins, proves them as husband and wife, if we are to accept the historical phraseology, by legal contract or mere ceremony, but they were very much naturally inclined by disposition & constitution towards this relation. This alone can be the reasonable meaning of Twashtri forming them as husband and wife in the womb. Otherwise, are we to think that wise T. Williams is piling objections upon dejectionous unwittingly against his position? Or, if T. Williams be right, might we not question which of the three alternatives is true? Were Yama and Yami born of Vaivasvat, or of Gandharv and his watery wife of Twashtri in *his* womb?

Again quoting 9th verse, says T. Williams "that in heaven and earth pairs, "mithuna," i. e. twins are closely

„united.” Here again, how does T. Williams conceive the „mithuua” which means pair means twins? Does the fact of the pairs being mated prove that the twins are mated?

T. Williams’ criticism on the tenth verse is no better. “Yatra jamayah krivan ajami” which means, the childless become with the child by the marriage relation, is translated by our Sanskrit scholar of twenty years’ standing, into “hereafter blood relations will do what is unbecoming their blood relationship. At this stage comes Swami’s quotation on *Niyoga*, where Yama says, “Desire another husband than myself.” We may leave verses 11-12 as the relation of brother and sister which T. Williams wants to establish between Yama and Yami has already, by his own translations, been proved to be false.

Now, Sir, if, after this, any one cavils as to the correctness of Dayananda’s translation why that man is an idiot. I have shown that the allegorical dialogue is not between twins and that Swami’s translation is right. It is the tenth verse, quoted by Swami, that T. Williams criticizes and translates falsely so as to show that a woman should not, if her husband be impotent, betake herself to some other married man. Dayananda’s vilifier, T. Williams, calls himself a scholar of twenty years’ standing! I am quite prepared to subscribe to this, that having proved T. Williams and his God guilty of deliberately telling lies and of having scant respect for the Bible, thus charging the Divinity with grossly immoral attributes, T. Williams is undoubtedly the most dangerous enemy of the Bible of his times. The Vedas, however, are beyond such puerile assaults.



T. WILLIAMS' LETTER  
To the Editor of the *Arya Patrika*  
About NIYOGA

—:O:—

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—Permit me herewith to redeem the promise I made you, printed June 18th, of giving "another instance of Dayananda's scant respect for the book that he proclaims as superior to any other."

In the *Satyartha Praksha*, (my copy was printed 1884) on page 118, Dayananda puts the question :—Does Niyoga take place even when the husband is living, as well as when he is dead?" The answer he gives himself is :—"It takes place even when he is living." Now we know what Dayananda means by Niyoga. It is that when a couple (man and wife) has no children then the non-impotent party (were the wife) may co-habit with certain others of the opposite sex for the sake of obtaining children.

In the preceding part of the Chapter he teaches what a wife should do when her husband dies. Advancing from this he here shows what a wife should do even when the husband is living but impotent. He starts the astounding doctrine *that the wife of a childless man while that man is yet alive may betake herself to some other married man in order to have a child by him.* Support for this monstrous doctrine he pretends to find, not in *Manu* as before, but, strange to say, in the *Rig Veda*, and quotes part of the 10th verse of the 10th hymn of the 10th mandala, as the grand authority, and the only authority for it.

Now I do not mean to say that there is no indecency in the *Rig Veda*, for there is as I can show, but it was left for

Dayananda, the founder of the Arya Samaj, to show that the Rig Veda actually enjoins the grossly immoral doctrine that a woman should betake herself to some other married man for cohabitation if her own husband be impotent ! I do not mean to say either that the Hindus hear this doctrine for the first time from the Dayanandis, for it is notorious that as a matter of practice the thing has been done by the Hindus for centuries. Use is made in this way of the Panday Brahmins at Allahabad, and it is this kind of thing that has brought such ill fame to the Mahajans of the Vallabhacharya sect, and attaches such an ill character to the Jaina marriage rites. But what I would say is this that I have reason for thinking that this monstrous doctrine has now, for the first time in the history of the Hindus, been fathered upon the Rig Veda, and that the unenviable distinction of so fathering it belongs to Dayananda, the founder of the Arya Samaj.

But, Sir, the unenviability of this distinction becomes a thousand times stronger, when it is discovered that it is all a *lie*. Yes, Sir, to say that the Rig Veda teaches & enjoins this doctrine is a *gross lie*. What can any man think of Dayananda after such an instance of scandalous falsification of the Rig Veda,—the book he professes to revere as a divine revelation and yet drags so ruthlessly in the mire.

Are you not aware Sir, that in what Dayananda quotes from Rig Veda 10, 10, *the speaker is a brother, and the woman he speaks to is that brother's SISTER !!!* The speaker is Yama and the woman he speaks to is Yami, his sister,—aye not only his sister, but his *twin sister* !



What wonder that upto this time no Hindu was ever so mad as to father such a doctrine upon the Rig Veda, for every Hindu who knew the Veda at all, knew that it is Yama that speaks and that he speaks to his twin sister Yami. Dayananda translates it, saying that the speaker is a husband and the woman he speaks to the speaker's wife. Now here he *deliberately lies*. I say it with all positiveness that Dayanand knew that it was Yama that speaks and that he speaks to his twin sister Yami. How terrible then is the lie that he is guilty of !!!—terrible, because he deliberately lies against a book he professes to believe in as, and proclaims to be, a divine revelation.

The only way for the Dayanandis to escape from this damning charge is to show that it is not Yama that speaks and that the woman he speaks to is not Yami his twin sister. But how vain any such contradiction must be I will show conclusively. For—

(1) A part from the hymn itself, the earliest authority capable of being adduced is Yaska. He in Nir. 6, 5, 4 quotes the 13th verse of this same hymn and his commentator begins his comment by saying, "Yami spaks to Yama," &c., &c. But lest any one say that an author is not bound by what his commentator might say, I hasten to give Yaska's own words. When explaining in Nir. 11, 3, 13, the 14th verse of this evening hymn Rig 10, 10, he himself says "Yami Yamam chakame tam pratyachachiksha" which means that "Yami desired sexual intercourse with Yama." He refused her. Now surely this is plain enough for it is evident that Yaska and his commentator regard the verses they quote as

part of a dialogue between Yama and Yami in which Yami desires cohabitation with Yama, but that Yama refuses. What has this to do with an impotent husband bidding his wife go to another married man for cohabitation !!! Yaska's commentator says expressly that Yaman was Yami's brother. It is needless to remind you, Sir, that this Nirukta of Yaska is a Vedanga and therefore has full Vedic authority. How dare Dayananda go directly in the teeth of Yaska whom he professes to altogether respect and say that here we have the case of an impotent husband !!

(2) My next authority is one scarcely inferior to Yaska: It is Katyayana. His sarvanukramanika of the Rig Veda, giving the Rishi and Devata &c. of every hymn of that Veda is the great authority for those matters and is respected by all. He, Katyayana, too is the author of the Sranta sutras of the Satapatha Brahmana of the Yajur Veda and as a Grammarian is second not even to Panini, and the Mahabhashya of Patanjali is engaged chiefly in illustrating Katyayana's vartikas on Panini's Grammar. As to the overwhelming character therefore of Katyayana's authority in all matters such as we are discussing, there can be no question. Now, in his sarvanukramanika, he says that there is no Rishi or Swata of this hymn Rigveda 10, 10, but he says that the hymn is a dialogue between Yama and Yami son and daughter of Vaivasvat. His words are "Vaivasvayor Yama Yami yoh samvadah." Now, Sir, apart from the hymn itself, I would be impossible to bring anybody whose authority can in any respect anywhere approach that of either of these. But now, I turn to the hymn itself.



(8) (a) The names Yama and Yami occur in the hymn six times, three times each—as proper names. In the 13th verse, Yama occurs in the vocative case, ‘O Yama’ and in 14th verse Yame occurs in the same case “O Yami.” These are the two last verses. The patashet shows that no other construction than that of the vocative case is possible. This then shows the *names* of the interlocutors.

(b) Now as to their *relationship*. In the 2nd verse Yama calls Yami his kinswoman *salakshma*. In the 14th verse Yama says that the Gandharva and his watery wife, were their (Yama and Yami) source—‘Nabhih,’ and that their relationship was consanguinous—“jami.” In the 5th verse Yami says that Tvashter formed them as husband and wife—‘dam-pate, in the womb. She hereby shows they were united as twins and she argues from that they ought to be man and wife. Again in verse 9, she argues in the same way that in heaven and earth, pairs,—‘mithuna,—i. e. twins are closely united—‘Sabandu,’ and in the same verse she says she wishes to treat Yama as not consanguinous connected with her. In the 10th verse Yami says that hereafter blood relations—“jamayah”—will do what is unbecoming their blood relationship—“ajami.” In the 11th Yami complains that Yama though a *brother*,—‘bhrata’—does not help her, and that though she is his sister,—‘svasa’—yet he allows calamity to come upon her. In the 12th verse Yama refuses to cohabit with Yami because he says they call him a *dimir*—‘papam,’ who sexually approaches—‘niyacchat’ his sister—‘svasa ram,’ and in the end of the same verse he says “thy brother, O fair

one, deserves not this,"—"na te bhrata, subhaya, vashiyetat.' In the Atharva Veda copy of this hymn this verse is enlarged and Yama's refusal made more decided and solemn.

Now, sir, if after this any one cavils as to the relationship of Yama and Yami, why that man is an idiot.

I have then shown that the speakers throughout this dialogue, are twins, a brother and sister. The sister Yami desires ardently that her brother Yama should sexually lie with her. The brother Yama points out the sin of so doing, and steadily refuses her, but tells her, to desire and embrace some other man. It is just this in the 10 verse that Dayananda quotes, and translates falsely, so as to show that a woman should, if her husband be impotent, betake herself to some other married man, for the sake of obtaining off-spring !!! Dayananda's apt scholar, Guru Datta, calls his master "the only Vedic Scholar of his time." I am quite prepared to subscribe however to this, that having proved Dayananda guilty of deliberately falsifying the Veda and of endeavouring to father upon the Rigveda a grossly immoral doctrine of which that Veda is wholly innocent, Dayananda is undoubtedly by far the *most dangerous enemy of the Veda of his times*.

Your faithfully,  
T. WILLIAMS.



## FRAGMENT.

The following is subjoined to the Criticism to some portion of which it belongs. The whole of the Criticism was not prepared by the late Pt. Gurn Datta, M. A., for the press. It was in mere lecture notes. Hence it is very defective.

I shall now proceed with my explanation of each one of the Mantras giving Monier William's translation of the same, so that both might appear side by side in a position not to be compared

the Divine essentials within the very interior of every living soul

Compare with the above Monier William's translation of the same (3rd) mantra Says he :—

“(The sun) whose beams reveal his presence.

Gleaming like brilliant flames, to nation after nation”

In vain do we seek for that purity of meaning, that sublimity of thought, that absorbing importance of the subject of matter, in Williams' translation of the Mantra. *janam omu* to William's scholarly mind, means “nation after nation” The Ketaveh and Agnayah become beams & brilliant flames” In vain do the philologist- of the west try to distort the sense of Vedic Mantras, and to make it correspond with the records of a primitive, comparatively savage and mythological ages I say, in vain, do these so-called scholars of oriental language, try to interpret the Vedic records according to the light of their brain-bread, I mean, fancy-bread science, philology For, all philologies, scholarships and learning melt away like ice before the concentrated, penetrative, heat-pouring potent beams of truth†

We come now to the 5th Mantra of this Sukta, with Monier William's characteristic translation . . . . “Thou (the sun) risest in the sight of all the race of men, and all the host of heaven” Can Williams ever be said to understand the meanings of Vedic Mantras, or specifically, say of this Mantra? Where is his conception of Vedic mythologies? Where is his keen Christian's sense which smells of element-worship in the Vedas! Has it gone so wrong as to incapacitate him even from understanding the simplest things? The sun never rises at once in the sight of all the race of men; but poor ignorant superstitious Vedic worshippers might have imagined so, but can even an idiot a Zulu savage, that has not even the millionth part of the experience that Williams has—can he, even he imagine the sun to rise in the sight of all the host of Heaven—he means the starry firma-

ment. No ! Expressed in the language of a savage the sun simply blinds the glittering sights of starry host of the Heaven. It simply blows the night gems, the stars, into a fine powder of nothingness and oblivion. But it never rises in the sight of all the host of Heaven. for, as it rises, the stars, get blinded and shrink into nothingness. Whence, then, the mistake into which Monier Williams has stepped ? Clearly it is thus Williams translates *devanam* into the starry host of Heaven. He has forgotten his translation of *deva* into gods and deities. But here *devanam* means all the host of Heaven. Monier Williams' memory further slips the words of the mantra *pratyā vishvam swardeshe*. It seems that the Vedic poet had put this unmeaning phrase here only to keep up the poetical metre ! But another explanation is possible. Williams was so much occupied with all the host of Heaven that as the sun rose, with the host of Heaven, departed his memory of this phrase also. Hence the vacuum in his translation.

We have said that God is the cause of this panorama of the universe. Is He not fit to be worshipped ? He who undoubtedly lives in us, mortal *manushyan* men, and in the hearts of the wise *devas* as well as the material objects of creation. He who lives by actually reading in the interior of every thing and being *pratyang*. yes He is the most fit object of our worship. In worshipping Him, we do not worship a mere phantom-picture, we do not worship a distant being or existence, but the ever-present, omniscient living God. It is no worship of Christ, one, who, if Bible gossip be true, lived and died some 1900 years ago, who is now no more among us, who lived in Judea and Jerusalem, not in India or America, who lived among the Hebrews, not among the Aryas and the American Indians, and in spite of all this, who only lived, but does not live as he did once in human form, in flesh and blood. Christ-days are gone, but God-days are ever alive. Compared with the pure and sublime faith of the Vedas, which is also the faith of the Aryas compared with the worship of the living divinity in us, Christianity is but a very crude form of idolatry. Further more the Vedas enjoin a divinity worship not in solemn words and amid congregation, in sky piercing churches and "farces of fruitless prayer," but in the living temple of human heart, a worship which consists only in the *realisation on earth* and hereafter of that *Universal bliss*, that reigns calmly every where, *vishvam swardeshe*.



## E R R A T A.

Page	Line	Read	For
3	28	„ for	„ or
5	30	„ then	„ hen
6	26	„ a	„ s
6	30	„ general	„ geueal
9	19	„ Separating	„ teparating
9	20	„ isolation	„ issolation
9	22	„ no	„ on
9	27	„ considered	„ cansidered
9	27	„ sufficient,	„ sufficient
11	14	„ of,	„ of
12	21	„ applied	„ appliedo
12	29	„ mentaries	„ omentaries
13	27	„ circumscribed	„ tircumscribed
15	27	„ between	„ betweon
15	28	„ get	„ geot
16	28	„ authors	„ anthors
16	30	„ is,	„ is
16	30	„ them	„ them,
20	9	„ European	„ Enropean
22	12	„ quickly	„ quickly
22	25	„ human	„ humam
26	3	„ of	„ oi
26	11	„ source	„ saurce
29	11	„ anecdotes	„ aneceote
30	24	„ brilliant	„ brilliant
33	30	„ fallacious	„ fallcieous
34	1	„ anachronism	„ andchronism
35	18	„ of	„ ot
36	13	„ interpretations	„ interpretations
36	13	„ current	„ curren
36	15	„ as	„ at
36	19	„ philosophical,	„ philosophicai

Page	Line	Read	For
41	2	„ called	„ ealled.
43	17	„ sun	„ snn
43	17	„ no	„ nor
44	28	„ superficial	„ perfcial
45	1	„ ma	„ mo
50	21	„ left	„ eft
50	22	„ er	„ ler
51	8	„ translating	„ tanslating
52	1	„ not be	„ not
53	20	„ the	„ tho
53	24	„ whatever	„ whatever
54	9	„ what he	„ wha the
59	22	„ pervade	„ pervadel
61	6	„ scholars	„ scholar
62	21	„ small	„ mall
64	8	„ endow	„ endowr
65	1	„ as	„ a
67	7	„ the	„ thei
67	30	„ things	„ thihs
70	30	„ And	„ Ann
72	3	„ Soul	„ souls
78	24	„ equator	„ equators
79	23	„ presented	„ presentede
84	5	„ standard	„ standard.
84	26	„ association	„ associatione
85	19	„ kinetic	„ kinetie
85	30	„ water	„ water,
90	30	„ the	„ he
91	16	„ existence	„ existenece
91	16	„ diverse	„ diverse
91	22	„ world	„ worldl
91	24	„ institution	„ iinstitution
92	10	„ conducting	„ condvctlng
92	16	„ unuatural	„ nnnatural



Page	Line	Read	For
93	16	„ themselves	„ themseives
94	18	„ obedience	„ bedience
95	26	„ entrap	„ eniraq
109	17	„ difficult	„ dfficult
112	4	„ of.	„ of
112	18	„ values	„ valuese
112	22	„ involves	„ involuess
114	11	„ what	„ whait
114	19	„ individuals	„ individuaes
116	21	„ perpetual	„ perpatual
116	27	„ produces	„ prodnces
119	18	„ his	„ this
119	20	„ are	„ re
122	4	„ peoplest	„ peoples
125	4	„ diffused	„ diffussed
125	7	„ organs	„ organ
128	13	„ means	„ maens
128	19	„ formnsd	„ ormed
128	23	„ principles	„ rinciples
132	4	„ about	„ bout
134	6	„ sanctity	„ sancity
140	27	„ wheels	„ weels
141	29	„ watch	„ wash
142	7	„ thought	„ hought
143	24	„ existence	„ extence
144	14	„ so the	„ the so
150	8	„ communicated,	„ communicated
150	25	„ contemplation,	„ contemplationt
151	3	„ adapta	„ adapat
164	18	„ it their	„ their it
167	6	„ professions	„ proression
167	12	„ the	„ ihe
167	20	„ improved	„ improveed
167	27	„ wealth	„ wealthy

Page	Line	Read	For
167	30	" problem	" roblem
168	10	" unfortunately	" unifortunately
168	17	" civilization	" civilzation
169	30	" and	" d
170	6	" subject	" subiect
172	3	" sovereign	" soverign
172	20	" existing	" existfng
172	28	" of	" o
175	6	" susceptible	" susceptibfe
178	12	" powerful	" wowerful
178	28	" permanent	" permanant
178	29	" logy	" ogy
179	17	" much	" mnch
180	20	" alone	" alones
180	30	" have	" ave
184	23	" positive	" postive
184	27	" spirit	" spirite
186	24	" interposition	" interposition
190	23	" which	" whicn
190	24	" fluid	" fluid
192	24	" separation	" eparation
198	23	" involuntary	" involuntry
201	21	" manas	" means
210	14	" accordingly	" accordinglg
211	11	" the	" the,
213	20	" consciousness	" conseiousness
215	10	" phenomena	" phenemena
216	8	" an	" au
216	25	" human	" human
216	29	" a soul	" aoul
218	19	" illustration	" illustation
219	24	" squeezed	" sqeezed
220	21	" renders	" renters
221	5	" is	" in



Page	Line	Read	For
223	12	conscious	onscious
223	30	integration	intergration
224	12	of	o
225	5	nervous	nevous
225	16	nerves	uerves
227	18	physiological	physioloegical
228	10	inference	inferenco
228	11	recall	recal
229	18	cosmos	casmos
231	21	gorgeous	forgeous
231	26	drives	driver
235	5	audible	edible
237	4	emetic	emitic
238	30	considered	considereds
240	22	thereunto	thereunte
242	29	author	auther
244	21	tures	ures
245	14	remember	rememor
247	7	essential	essentiai
248	1	add	ad
250	20	only	oniy
255	21	ritual	retual
256	20	ing	ng
256	23	latter	lattor
257	1	happened	happended
257	6	provincialised	provincialised
259	15	found	fouud
260	30	rather say	rather
261	2	is	fs
261	4	second	seconp
261	14	deteriorate	detereorate
261	28	advance	advence
262	5	science	scelence
262	20	case	csae

Page	Line	Read	For
262	28	" in	" is
264	26	" ly	" y
262	12	" human	" humam
263	10	" express	" expresss
279	7	" upon	" npon
279	24	" scholar	" schorlar
280	16	" sacred	" secired
286	9	" sacred	" sacrep
290	7	" such	" suchs
290	8	" sometimes	" sometime
295	29	" Israel	" Israe
302	9	" novel	" navel
302	19	" legal	" lega
302	25	" upon objections	upon dejections
303	1	" that	" tha
303	30	" assails	" assailes

—:O:—

## Religious Books.

Five Great Duties ...	...	...	Rs. 0 4 0
Indian Religions ...	...	...	" 0 12 0
Triumph of Truth ...	...	...	" 1 0 0
Six Vedic Readers ...	...	...	" 1 0 0
Kena & Prashna Upanishats	...	...	" 0 4 0

—:O:—



